

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LII

MAY, 1954

NO. 1097

What is International Communism?

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES

U.S. Secretary of State

*An address at the Tenth Inter-American Conference, Caracas, Venezuela,
March 8, 1954.*

THE United States has introduced a resolution under the agenda item, "Intervention of International Communism in the American Republics." Our proposal is before you.

Its preambles first recall the prior resolutions finding international Communism to be a threat, and then record our judgment that this threat still persists. The first operative portion declares that if the international Communist movement should come to dominate the political institutions of any American state, that would be a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of us all, endangering the peace of America, and

calling for appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties.

The second operative portion calls for disclosures and exchanges of information, which would expose and weaken the Communist conspiracy.

What is international Communism?

In the course of the general debate, one of the foreign ministers asked: "What is international Communism?" I thought that by now every foreign minister of the world knew what international Communism is. It is disturbing if the foreign affairs of one of our American republics are conducted by one so innocent that

he has to ask that question. But since the question has been asked, it shall be answered.

International Communism is that far-flung clandestine political organization which is operated by the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Since 1939, it has brought fifteen once independent nations into a state of abject servitude. It has a hard core of agents in practically every country of the world. The total constitutes not a theory, not a doctrine, but an aggressive, tough political force, backed by great resources and serving the most ruthless empire of modern times.

Most of the leaders of the Soviet party appear before the eyes of the world as responsible officials of the Soviet Government. In this capacity they conduct relations with the other governments through the traditional institutions of diplomacy. But at the same time they operate and control this world-wide clandestine political organization to which I have referred.

CONTROLLED BY MOSCOW

Until the Second World War, Moscow's control over this organization was exercised openly through the central headquarters of the Communist International, the so-called Comintern. That was a political association to which all of the Communist Parties belonged, and it had its seat in Moscow.

During the war the Comintern was officially abolished. Since that time the control over the foreign Communist Parties has been exercised by the Moscow leaders secretly and informally, but for the most part no less effectively than before.

As proof of this fact one does not need to search for the precise channels through which this control proceeds, although some of them in fact are known. If one compares Soviet propaganda with the political positions taken by individual Communist officials and agents around the world, both from the standpoint of substance and timing, it becomes clear, beyond possibility of doubt, that there is this highly disciplined hierarchical organization which commands the unquestioned obedience of its individual members.

The disciplinary requirements include a firm insistence that loyalty to the movement, which means in effect loyalty to the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, shall take precedence over every other obligation, including love of country, obligation to family and the honor of one's own personal conduct.

These conclusions are not speculation; they are established facts, well known to all who have seriously studied the Communist apparatus. The fact that this organization exists does not mean that all members of all Communist Parties everywhere are conscious of its existence and of

their relationship to it. Only a small proportion of Communist Party members are initiated into complete awareness of the nature of the movement to which they belong and the real sources of its authority. Most national Communist Parties masquerade as normal patriotic, political impulses, led by indigenous elements.

CONSPIRACY HELD SHAPED

Actually every one of these parties represents a conspiracy within a conspiracy. The rank-and-file members, while serving the purpose of duping others, are, to a considerable extent, duped by their own leaders. The leaders do not reveal fully to the rank and file either the nature of their own allegiance or the sources of their own authority and funds.

The over-all purpose for which this organization is maintained and operated is to act as an instrument for the advancement of the world-wide political aims of the dominant group of Moscow leaders.

This, then, is the answer to "What Is International Communism?" in the Americas. It may next be asked whether this international Communist apparatus actually seeks to bring this hemisphere, or parts of it, into the Soviet orbit. The answer must be in the affirmative.

I shall not here accuse any government or any individuals of being either plotters, or the dupes of plotters. We are not sitting here as a court to try governments or individuals. We sit, rather, as legislators. As such, we need to know what will enable us to take appropriate action of a general character in the common interest. Therefore I shall confine myself to presenting well-established facts of that character.

When the Comintern was operating openly, it trained at Moscow, largely in the Lenin School, numerous persons for the Americas. Some of them are still active. There was a special Comintern headquarters, and there were secret field offices which controlled and supported Communist activities in Latin America.

FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

The Comintern also developed a series of international front organizations designed to enable its agents to get popular backing from special groups, such as labor, youth, women students, farmers, etc. These front organizations also served as cover for the Soviet intelligence services.

When the Soviet Communist Party went through the form of abolishing the Comintern, these same front organizations were carried on in a dif-

ferent form, with headquarters shifted from Moscow usually to satellite capitals. The Communist International of Youth emerged as the World Federation of Democratic Youth Union, with headquarters in Prague.

There is the Women's International Democratic Federation, with headquarters in East Berlin. There is the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, taking the place of its Comintern predecessor, the International Juridical Association. There is the World Peace Council, located in Prague. There is the World Committee Against War and Fascism. Most powerful of all is the World Federation of Trade Unions, seated under Soviet auspices in Vienna. There is the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations Abroad, which channels propaganda through its local outlets, the various Soviet "friendship" societies.

These front organizations carry on important activities in many of the American states. Their members in this hemisphere go back and forth to the Soviet-bloc countries, using funds which are supplied by the Soviet Communist Party.

The basic facts I outline are well known. They could be supplemented by masses of detail, but that is unnecessary for our present purposes. It is enough to know that international Communism operates strongly in this hemisphere to accomplish the political purposes of its leaders, who

are at the same time the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party and of the Soviet Union.

LIBERATION AIM DENIED

International Communism is not liberating, but enslaving. It has been suggested that even though the international Communist movement operates in this hemisphere, it may serve a liberating purpose, compatible with the principles of our American states. Few, I believe, would argue for that openly. The thesis is advanced, rather, by innuendo and insinuation.

Such suggestions lose all plausibility when we recall what this Communist movement has done to the nations and the peoples it has come to dominate. Let us think first in terms of nations.

Many of us knew at the United Nations Jan Masaryk, son of the great author of Czechoslovak freedom. He was a foreign minister who believed almost until the end that the Communist movement in his country was something different, that it could be reconciled with the national freedom to which his father and he were so passionately dedicated.

But in the end, his broken corpse was offered to the world as mute evidence of the fact that international Communism is never "different," and that there can be no genuine reconciliation between it and national freedom.

Czechoslovakia was stripped of every vestige of sovereignty as we of the Americas understand that term. It was added to the list of victims which already, in Europe, included Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, East Germany, Albania, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria. These ten European nations, once proud and honorable examples of national freedom, have become Soviet serfdoms or worse.

DIFFERENCE IS PICTURED

Within all the vast area now embracing one-third of the world's people, where the military power of the Soviet Union is dominant, no official can be found who would dare stand up and openly attack the Government of the Soviet Union. But in this hemisphere it takes no courage for a representative of one of the smallest American countries openly to attack the government of the most powerful.

I rejoice that that kind of freedom exists in the Americas even if it may be at times abused. But the essential is that there be a relationship of sovereign equality. We of the United States want to keep it that way. We seek no satellites, but only friendly equals. We never want to see at the Pan-American table those who speak as tools of non-American powers. We want to preserve and defend an American society in which even the weak may speak boldly because they

represent national personalities which, as long as they are free, are equal.

It is the purpose of our resolution to assure that there will always be in this hemisphere such national personalities and dignity. If now we turn to the question of what international Communism has done to individual human beings, we find it has stripped them, too, of their sense of dignity and worth. Professional propagandists for Communism talk glibly of lofty aims and high ideals. That is part of the routine—and fraudulent—appeal of the international Communist movement. It is one of the principal means by which the dissatisfied are led to follow false leaders.

But once international Communism has gained its end and subjected people to the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, then the welfare of the people ceases to be a practical concern.

Communism, in its initial stage, was supposed primarily to serve the workers and provide them not with spiritual values—for Communism is atheistic—but at least with material well-being. It is worthwhile to observe what actually happened to this favored group in the countries subjugated by Communist power.

In these countries workers have become virtual slaves and millions of them literally are slaves. Instructive facts are to be found in the United Nations report on forced labor which

was presented to the Assembly at its last session. The authors of this report were three eminent, independent personalities from India, Norway and Peru. The report finds that the Soviet Union and its satellites used forced labor on a vast scale. Prior evidence presented to the United Nations indicated approximately 15 million persons habitually fill Soviet labor camps.

The forced-labor report calls the Soviet method of training and allocating manpower "a system of forced or compulsory labor." Soviet workers are the most underpaid, overworked persons in any modern industrial state. They are the most managed, checked on, spied on and unrepresented workers in the world today. There is no freedom of movement, for the Russian worker is not allowed to leave his job and shift to another job. He is bound by his labor book.

Except for a relative few who have class privileges, wages provide only a pitiful existence. Now, thirty-seven years after the October revolution, unrest and discontent have so mounted in Soviet Russia itself that its rulers were forced publicly to notice them and to promise relief.

Conditions in the Soviet satellite countries are even worse than in Russia. The captive peoples have been subjected to sharply decreased living standards since they lost their freedom, and to greater exploitation than prevails even in Russia. The work-

ers' outbreak in East Germany last June showed in one revealing flash how desperate the people have become. Young boys armed only with stones dared to face up to Soviet tanks.

SOLDIERS HEAVILY ARMED

When I was in the East sector of Berlin last month, the Soviet Foreign Minister referred to that outbreak and said steps have been taken to be sure it would not happen again. I saw those steps. They consisted of thousands upon thousands of heavily-armed soldiers, with machine guns and tanks.

Traditions of liberty have been established in this hemisphere under the leadership of many great patriots. They fought for individual human rights and dignity. They lighted guiding beacons along freedom's road which burned brightly in the healthy air of patriotic fervor. These beacons must not be stifled by the poisonous air of despotism now being fanned toward our shores from Moscow, Prague and Budapest.

These places may seem far away. But let us not forget that in the early part of the preceding century, the first danger to the liberties and independence which Bolivar, San Martin and other of their heroic associates had won for the new republics stemmed precisely from a despotic alliance formed by Russia.

Sometimes it seems we recall that

threat only in terms of colonialism. Actually, that threat was deemed most grave in terms of the desire of Czarist Russia and its allies to extend their despotic political system to this hemisphere.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

I recall that President Monroe, in a message to Congress on Dec. 2, 1823, addressed himself primarily to that phase of the problem. He spoke of ending the future colonization by any European power, but he spoke with greater emphasis and at greater length on the danger which would come if "the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent of this hemisphere."

What he then said was being said in similar terms by other great American patriots and defenders of human liberty. And those sentiments long since have ceased to be merely unilateral. They have become an accepted principle of this hemisphere. That is why it seems to us we would be false to our past unless we again proclaimed that extension to this hemisphere of alien despotism would be a danger to us all which we unitedly oppose.

The U.S. Government is well aware of the fact there are few problems more difficult, few tasks more odious than that of effectively exposing and thwarting the danger of international Communism. As we have pointed out,

that danger cloaks itself behind fine-sounding words; it uses the cover of many well-intentioned persons, and it so weaves itself into the fabric of community life that great courage and skill are required to sever the evil from the good.

The slogan of non-intervention can plausibly be invoked and twisted to give immunity to what is in reality flagrant intervention. The fact, however, that the defense of freedom is difficult and that it calls for courage is no adequate excuse for shutting one's eyes to the fact that freedom is endangered. Freedom never is preserved for long except by vigilance and with dedicated effort. Those who do not have the will to defend liberty soon lose it.

Danger to liberty constantly recurs in ever-changing form. To meet that danger requires flexibility and imagination. Each of our nations in the past has had to take difficult and dangerous decisions of one kind or another on behalf of the independence and integrity of this hemisphere.

During the nineteenth century, more than one American nation, including my own, risked the hazard of war against great military powers rather than permit the intrusions into this hemisphere of the aggressive forces of European Imperialism. During the twentieth century, when the evil forces of militarism and Fascism twice sought world domination, the United States paid a

great price in blood and treasure for what served us all.

Each of our American republics has made its own great and indispensable contribution to what now has become a glorious tradition. Today, we face a new peril that is, in many respects, greater than any of the perils of the past, and it takes an unaccustomed form.

It is backed by resources greater than have ever before been accumulated under a single despotic will. However, we need not fear because we, too, have greater assets. We have greater solidarity and we have greater trust born out of past fraternal association. But just as the danger assumes unconventional form, so our response may also need to be new in its form.

We need not, however, solve all these matters here. What we do need to do here is to identify the peril, to develop a will to meet it unitedly if ever united action should be required and, meanwhile, to give strong moral support to those governments which have the responsibility of exposing and eradicating within their borders the danger represented by alien intrigue and treachery.

Of course, words alone will not suffice. But words can be meaningful. They can say that each of our nations, in whatever way is truly its own, will be master of its destiny. Thus, we will have served our common cause against its enemies.

It is in that spirit and in that hope that the United States presents its resolution.

Reading and the Catholic Family

Families in which Catholic books, periodicals and magazines are received and regularly read are usually faithful to the duties of Mass attendance and the reception of the Sacraments; they take part in the life of the parish and are interested in what is going on in Catholic circles throughout the world.

Such families follow with pride what the Holy Father does and says for the edification of the world; they sympathize with their brethren who are enduring persecution at the hands of atheists, Communists and other enemies of the Church; they are moved in the spirit of charity to help fellow Catholics in the most distant parts of the world in time of distress or disaster; they rejoice and express their gratitude to God when they learn of the triumphs which our Holy Church is achieving, notwithstanding the opposition of enemies in so many countries of the world.—*Pastoral letter of Most Rev. Joseph F. Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans, Jan. 31, 1954.*

Communist War on Religion

MOST REV. PATRICK A. O'BOYLE, D.D.,
Archbishop of Washington

Sermon delivered at a Reparation Day Mass., St. Matthew's Cathedral,
Washington, D.C., December 27, 1953.

"It is written: 'I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered.'" (Matthew, 26:31)

IN THE year 1937, Pope Pius XI warned the world against the fearful dangers of atheistic Communism in these words: "For the first time in history we are witnessing a struggle, cold-blooded in purpose and mapped out to the least detail, between man and 'all that is called God.' Communism is by its nature antireligious. It considers religion as 'the opiate of the people' because the principles of religion which speak of a life beyond the grave dissuade the working people from the dream of a Soviet paradise which is of this world" (*On Atheistic Communism*, No. 22). In another message, he warned that when Communism seeks "to achieve these objectives, there is nothing which it does not dare, nothing for which it has respect or reverence; and when it has come to power, it is incredible and portentous in its cruelty and inhumanity" (*On Reconstructing the Social Order*, No. 112).

When the Holy Father wrote these

words, many persons did not choose to read or attend to his warning. Some were taken in by glittering promises and ideal patterns of government. Others rejected Communism, but held that it was a weak growth in backward countries and could never be a menace to the great powers of the world. There were even those who rejoiced at the blood-bath of the Church in Spain, holding that it was the excesses of Catholicism and not the barbarity of Communism which provoked the cruelty of the commissars.

Today, the thoughtful person will admit that the Holy Father spoke with the voice of prophecy. What he saw clearly in the 1930's only the blindly partisan will deny in the 1950's. A war is raging today—not the cold war between the Western powers and the forces behind the Iron Curtain—but the even more deadly war between the atheistic leaders of the Kremlin and "all that is called God." Communism today is seeking nothing less than the total destruction of religion in the areas under its control.

We cannot stress this point too

strongly. The first victim of this war was our ancient and venerable sister Church in Russia. Next was the Catholic Church in Spain. Then Jew, Moslem, Buddhist and Protestant were each singled out as victims. For a while the defenders of Marxism could say that they were not opposed to religion as such, but only to the abuses in the Orthodox Church of Russia. They would argue that they did not attack the Catholic Faith, but only the so-called "politically-minded hierarchy, subject to the Vatican." Their attack on the Jewish faith was thinly veiled as a repudiation of Zionism. With the Moslems, it was supposed to be Arab imperialism which was fought. So the refrain went, but the relentless unveiling of the truth has demolished the lies of the propagandists. Communism stands indicted and convicted today as the foe of human freedom and dignity, a violator of our basic rights, an arrogant upstart whose clenched fist is raised in defiance of the Almighty.

Religion is the enemy, not the trumped-up political crimes of Church leaders. It is the faith of the ordinary man which is the object of attack; the leaders of the Church are singled out merely to dramatize the terror of the regime and to strike fear in the hearts of all believers. Prominent names make headlines, and the trials of Cardinals Stepinac, Mindszenty, and the arrest of Cardinal Wysynski were dramatic and news-

worthy. But millions of victims suffer silently, unknown to the press of the world. They are numbers, not names, buried in the cold anonymity of a silent execution or the living death of slave-labor camps.

The voices of these silent victims would cry in tones of thunder were their story to be known to the world. Let me speak for a moment to tell the tale of these silent sufferers. Go with me to a slave-labor camp in the desolate wastes of Siberia. See the picture of an old man, bearded and bent, shuffling along carrying heavy logs. The work is beyond his strength, but he dare not falter lest the savage dogs of the guards be set upon him. Who is this man? He is a rabbi, a leader of a small congregation of Jewish believers. What was his crime? He insisted on gathering the faithful in his house to worship in the manner that God had revealed to His chosen people. For this awful crime he was accused of Zionism and sent to join the army of the silent.

JEWS ATTACKED

Is this case exceptional? On the contrary, only a few years ago the Jewish Labor Committee submitted to the United Nations a documented charge that every phase of Jewish life is being stamped out among the two and one-half million Jews behind the Iron Curtain. Schools and synagogues are being obliterated. The crowning atrocity of all—thousands

of Jews who miraculously survived the concentration camps of Hitler are back in these very same camps as prisoners of the Communist Governments of East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Rumania.

Let me pick out another victim—this time it is a young man in his middle thirties. He was a Lutheran pastor from Latvia. In the year 1947, he defied the government edict forbidding the celebration of Christmas. He gathered his small congregation to celebrate the birth of the Prince of Peace. For this offense he was condemned as an enemy of the people. He and his flock were summarily packed off in the bitter cold of winter, in unheated cattle cars, for the long trip to a life of prison labor.

RECORD IS CLEAR

Protestant religious life, in an organized fashion, has been practically wiped out in Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and Bulgaria. It survives only with the greatest difficulty in East Germany and Czechoslovakia. Protestant missions and works of mercy in China have been closed. The record is clear; any believer in God, any person whose conscience rebels against the gross injustices of Communism, is considered an enemy of this regime.

Cruel as these stories are, they are mild compared with the afflictions visited upon the religious women in China. Nuns who had given up their

lives to ministering to the sick, the orphan, the homeless and abandoned poor were beaten by howling mobs. They were accused of being foreign spies, murderers of children, enemies of the people. If ever we wanted a clear demonstration of the Satanic nature of Communism, it is found in the "brain washing" that has debased the Chinese Reds. The people of China, as we know, are gentle and cultured. They respect the aged and revere family life. Yet, under this fiendish system, children denounce their parents. They hurl curses upon their elders. They beat and spit upon their benefactors, such as the unselfish nuns who gave so much to that ancient land.

Of them we can say, as St. Paul thundered against the pagans of his day: "And as they have resolved against possessing the knowledge of God, God has given them up to a reprobate sense, so that they do what is not fitting, being filled with all iniquity . . .; being full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity; being whisperers, detractors, hateful to God, irreverent, proud, haughty, plotters of evil; disobedient to parents, foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, without mercy" (*Romans*, 1:28-32).

It is clear that the struggle between Communism and religion is worldwide. It is directed against all faiths, against the simple believer as well as the leaders of churches. If

tolerance is practised at some times and in certain places, it is only an expedient dictated by the tactical needs of the moment. The long term strategy of Communism envisions only one goal: the complete destruction of religion.

Faced with this enemy, all believers should join in a crusade of prayer and protest, of common prayer to the Almighty that He might spare us this scourge; of protest to the nations of the world that they might denounce this crime against humanity. Such a plea was made sixteen years ago by Pope Pius XI. He said:

In this battle joined by the powers of darkness against the very idea of Divinity, it is Our fond hope that, besides the host which glories in the name of Christ, all those—and they comprise the overwhelming majority of mankind—who believe in God and pay Him homage may take a decisive part. We therefore renew the invitation . . . invoking their loyal and hearty collaboration “in order to ward off from mankind the great danger that threatens all alike” (*On Atheistic Communism*, No. 72).

May I respectfully and humbly repeat this invitation to all believers in God, indeed to all who recognize the dignity and worth of man, to unite in a crusade against atheistic, imperial Communism. First of all, this should be a crusade of prayer and reparation to Almighty God for the evils perpetrated upon believers of all nations and creeds. We can make our own the prayer of the dying

Saviour: “Forgive them, Father, for they know not what they do.” We can pray that the blessings of peace once more descend upon the world as a gift of the Prince of Peace. Let us never forget, in our preoccupation with political controversy and world affairs, that our struggle is not merely against flesh and blood, but against the spirits of evil who seem to have taken possession of the Communist blasphemers.

Let us not be diverted in this crusade by the antagonisms and grievances which too often divide us. This is not the occasion to enter into the issues which have unfortunately caused incidents of religious intolerance in our land. With half the world in flames, should we argue over precedence in putting out the fire? Or should we rather all walk humbly before God, admitting our sins and pleading that the scourge of Communism be lifted from the earth?

Together with prayer, the churches and synagogues of America should raise their voices in protest against the terrible persecution of believers behind the Iron Curtain. Our Government can proudly boast its concern for the rights of man and the basic freedoms which flow from human dignity. Is it too much to ask that we join with other free nations of the world in a request for a formal investigation by the United Nations of this diabolical attempt to exterminate all religion? May we not call

upon our delegates to international conferences to remain steadfast in holding to safeguards for basic human rights in all agreements among nations?

EFFECT OF PROTEST

We know that the rulers of the Kremlin respect only force of arms and not principles of right or wrong. But there are tens of millions of peoples in the world who have retreated to the sidelines in this struggle. Against such indifference or neutralism, the voice of protest for the right of faith will have a powerful effect. Even behind the Iron Curtain—and it does not completely cut out the voice of the free world—there will be millions heartened by our solidarity with them in their hour of trial.

The power of arms is great, and we do not underestimate the tragedy of atomic warfare. But let us not

underestimate the power of the spirit and the greatness of truth. The Church has known in other ages the dark hours of persecution. Thousands of martyrs have sealed their faith with their blood. Yet the Church has emerged from the Catacombs to rise to new heights of achievement. So it is today. If now the darkness of Calvary seems to prevail over vast regions of the earth, let us remember that Calvary was followed by Easter morn and the glory of the Resurrection. Christ told His followers to take courage, for He had conquered the world. This is the certainty of our faith. With such a faith, we shall not despair. Rather we go forward in trust and hope, knowing that He who has begun in us His good work, will perfect the same; that He who founded His Church upon the Rock of Peter, will be with us as a faithful protector, even to the end of the world.



Higher Education in Italy

As in France, there is a growing recognition that anti-clericalism has gained too much in the past from an undue association of the parish clergy with the more prosperous among their people. This was the subject of a much discussed Pastoral Letter of Msgr. Tedde, one of the youngest of the Italian Bishops, published in 1949, the year after his consecration at the age of forty-one to the See of Ales, in Sardinia. He declared that in future there must be no distinction between the baptisms, marriages and funerals of the rich and the poor; all must have the same numbers of officiating clergy and the same show of candles and flowers and so forth; there must no longer be a graduated scale of stole-fees, and clergy suffering financial loss as a result would, said the Bishop, have their loss made good from diocesan funds.—*London* TABLET, *England*, Jan. 23, 1954.

Church of Silence in Yugoslavia

REV. DR. ALOIS KUHAR

*Research and Publications Division,
Committee for a Free Europe*

Lecture delivered at the Carroll Club, New York, N.Y., October 13, 1953.

AS A Yugoslav I am, of course, expected to speak on the situation of religion in general and of the Catholic Church in particular under the present totalitarian regime in my country.

In giving you what will necessarily be but a rough estimate of the situation in my country, I may have to quote some figures and perhaps cite some names. But I wish you to know that I am well aware—as, in truth, everybody should be — that neither names nor figures have any significance against the appalling reality of what is happening throughout Eastern Europe. Over vast areas inhabited by well over 250 million Christians (among whom nearly 70 million are Catholics—almost twice the number of Catholics in the United States), there is in progress a painstakingly prepared and coolly executed murder of souls. This consists in a systematic uprooting of all the spiritual values upon which reposes our way of life, a ruthlessly methodical elimination of the Christian Faith from the hearts of nations which have

been Christian and Catholic for well over a thousand years.

While this wholesale destruction is going on, “silence reigns over the waters. . . .” Two silences, in fact.

1. *Silence in the afflicted countries themselves.* All external manifestation of the Faith is slowly vanishing under the onslaught of the atheistic terror. The worship of God is retreating into the silent depths of the souls of the harassed Christians. Resistance goes underground, behind the ramparts of conscience, where the struggle rages in lonely human hearts, and the advantage is all on the side of evil.

2. *Silence also in the free world.* When the free world does speak of the terrible drama developing behind the death curtain of Communist rule, it speaks in political, military and economic language and thinks of help and defense only in terms of weapons, political slogans and food parcels. It remains deaf, dumb and blind to the progress of the spiritual devastation.

The facts which I am now going to give about Yugoslavia have the

sole purpose of illustrating the impact of the de-christianization policy of Communism upon the vast empire over which the Soviets rule, and which they are determined, with all the means at their disposal, to convert to their godless, soul-less, materialistic creed.

COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP

Present-day Yugoslavia is a country with 17 million inhabitants, of whom nearly 7 million are of the Catholic Faith, over 8 million of the Greek Orthodox Faith and the rest Mohammedans. The Catholics and Orthodox have been Christians since the 8th or 9th century.

The Communists established their dictatorship in 1945 on the Soviet pattern. In 1948 Moscow repudiated them, not, as one might think, because of slackness in carrying out the Communist ideological drive, but for political and personal reasons stemming from the regime of Stalin. After that, the Yugoslav Communist dictatorship slowly turned to the West, first to obtain economic assistance, then to get arms. All the time it solemnly declared that nothing would be changed in the relentless progress of the original program to turn the country into a model Communist state.

The West, gambling on military, political and, to a certain extent, economic advantages, assented to this. The Communist regime obtained assistance in the form of cash, food and

arms. But it promised little, if anything, in return. It continued and even speeded up, without incurring any interference from the West, the process of "building Socialism." By this, Communists mean the setting up of a state based on one-party dictatorship, the organization of economic life and social relations along Marxist collectivist lines and the systematic perversion of the people on all educational levels. In this system the Communist Party wields all the authority and controls all the means to enforce its will. And so they have "built Socialism" and are still building it unhindered by—one is almost tempted to say with the connivance of—the non-Communist Christian world.

Because of its Western ties, news of religious persecution in Yugoslavia has been discreetly minimized or ignored. It needed such cases as the trial and imprisonment of a Cardinal, or the burning alive of a Bishop, or the beating up of priests before the very eyes of foreign visitors, to stir up some interest abroad and to raise some doubts.

MAKE-BELIEVE LEGISLATION

The Communist dictators have shrewdly built up a screen of make-believe legislation behind which they feel safe to carry out their evil designs. Thus:

1. They put into the Constitution a paragraph which guarantees, in

glowing and quite Western terms, freedom of conscience and religious practice for all.

2. They wrote education laws and regulations which allow free religious instruction for all who desire it.

3. They voted a Penal Code which punishes anyone interfering in the free exercise of the religious beliefs of fellow citizens.

4. They offered to priests and religious persons the benefits of social security provided they declared their acceptance of the law of the country.

5. In order to please the West and to make the camouflage perfect, they even changed the name of the Communist Party to "Union of Communists," and that of the People's Front, which is the camouflaged secular arm of the Party, into an innocent sounding "Socialist Alliance of the Working People."

To further the deception, visitors are shown "packed churches"; "displays of religious ceremonies" going on without hindrance; couples being married in churches; solemn confirmation services; free celebration of parish and family patrons' feasts; groups of children at religious instruction; religious burials, with all the bells ringing freely. Even religious publications are exhibited. As a result, gullible visitors beam with satisfaction and return to their homes convinced that religion in Yugoslavia is as free and unfettered as it is in their own country, and that reports of

persecution are only propaganda concocted in the kitchens of dispossessed "exiles" and circulated by dethroned and revengeful politicians.

What are the real facts?

NO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

1. Yes, the Constitution guarantees religious freedom, and religious instruction of the children is guaranteed in law. But in the Statutes of the Communist Party—which wields totalitarian power and the members of which staff all key posts and all levels of authority—it is laid down that religious affiliation and the exercise of religious practices are "incompatible" with membership in the Party. The official figure for Communist membership is 790,000, and that of candidates for membership 200,000. So for one million Yugoslavs, at a minimum, religion is not free and atheism is law.

Furthermore, officers of the armed forces and students in military academies are advised that the practice of religion is incompatible with their calling and that the sanction is immediate dismissal. There are, it is said, 30 divisions composing the present Yugoslav armed forces. By common standards this means a force of half a million soldiers, of whom 50,000 are officers. The total for the police and security forces is set at over half a million, among whom 50,000 are officers. For these one million men religion is not free.

Moreover, the teachers on all educational levels are advised that the practice of religion is not compatible with their vocation. There are approximately 40,000 teachers in Yugoslavia. Religion is not free for them and their families.

CONTROLLED BY THE PARTY

In addition, the entire state administration is controlled by the Communist Party. The same is true for industry and commerce, both being state monopolies. In all key posts in government and industry sit trusted Communists to whom it is left to pick their staffs in accordance with Party instructions. Religious practice is a bar to higher positions, an insurmountable obstacle to promotions and a disqualification for young applicants seeking employment. For all these hundreds of thousands of people and their families, who depend for their living upon the all-powerful totalitarian state, religion is not free.

Finally, the state wields the arbitrary axe of taxation. Taxes are not assessed by any legal standards. The local committees, ruled by Communists, are instructed to apply them according to local political requirements. The farmer, if he has not been forced into collective farming, would seem free to practise his religion without fear of outside interference. The local committee, however, sees to it that influential church-goers feel the full weight of arbitrarily fixed taxes

—which in innumerable cases amount to confiscatory proportions—until they yield.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES

2. Religious services are free. Yes, they are free. But to carry out religious services you need priests, you need buildings, you need vestments and books, and you need an income for the upkeep of priests and churches.

The Communist state has expropriated the Church down to the last square inch and to the last cent. Even the church buildings are state property. Graciously the state allows the faithful to use the churches, but in many cases high rents must be paid for their use. Thus the church has neither landed property, nor real estate, nor cash from which to subsist.

Collections? Free gifts of the faithful? Yes. But collections for which permission has not been obtained from the local authority are crimes punishable by law. The collection is confiscated, the beneficiary goes to jail. Cases could be cited of police raids during Mass to seize collections. Such raids on priests' lodgings are common occurrences. As a result, the churches are falling into disrepair (many had been destroyed during the war) and cannot be repaired.

Vestments cannot be replaced. There was a time when there were no candles, because the state did not sell them for religious purposes, and no

altar breads because the state refused to sell wheat flour to make them. At that time friends sent candles and altar breads from abroad, but most of the packages never arrived. Vestments have been sent from many countries, including America. I know of instances in which the packages reached their destination but where the import duties imposed were twice their market value and could not be paid. I know of cases where white altar vestments had to be made of bed sheets, and where Mass was celebrated by the priest wearing no ecclesiastical vestment but a stole—by special permission of the church authorities, I may add.

SEMINARIES CONFISCATED

To carry out religious services priests are necessary. They must be trained during long years of study and prayer in secluded seminaries. How can this be done when all the seminaries have been confiscated and in three instances only has permission been given to house young seminarians in rented rooms? What do they live on? What do they study from? This, only God knows, and the courageous Christians who brave the wrath of the Communist tyrant to support these youths by whatever poor means they still have. Food parcels from abroad have helped them to survive. But they need books which, if sent, never arrive. The newly-ordained priests have no cloth-

ing and no breviaries. None of the sets I know of which were sent from this country ever arrived. What can their training be like if carried out under such conditions? And who will train them once the old generation of qualified teachers has died out?

Vocations for the priesthood are surprisingly numerous. One must respectfully salute these young men and be grateful to God's grace, which is strong enough to sustain their courage. But Communism leaves nothing undone to stop the recruitment of priests. Would-be candidates are suddenly summoned by the police for investigations which go on for weeks and months. Or they are called up for military service, or their parents are molested and threatened.

Do you call this freedom of religion?

Churches are "packed," because resistance is still alive, but half of the churches are in disuse and the number of the ministering clergy is one-third of the pre-war figure. These are aging quickly, without the consolation of seeing young men take their places and their responsibilities.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

3. Religious instruction is free, they say. Yes. But the Catholics have no schools. Nor have the other Christian churches. Education is a monopoly, the most sacred and most closely guarded monopoly of the Communist state. Communism may

not be able to bend the older generation, but it seems certain to win the youth and, with the youth, also the future.

No religious instruction ("mysticism" they call it in official documents) of any kind may be given in the state school, and no subject taught may, in the slightest degree, reflect any kind of religious influence. The curriculum, from the public school in the village and the industrial suburb up to the highest educational establishments, is pure, crude Marxism, atheistic materialism, which excludes all spiritual values because it denies God, their Eternal Source. The curriculum is not only *a*-theistic in that it explains human facts without any reference to God; it is *anti*-theistic in that it brutally and intentionally destroys in the souls of the children whatever positive religious knowledge they may possess through the influence of their parents.

Religious instruction is allowed for those children only who can show a written certificate signed by both parents, stating that they wish their children to go to these instructions. Moreover, the instructions may be given only inside a church building, not in the priest's lodgings or elsewhere. I could cite many cases of priests who had to report to the police, and were even imprisoned, for talking to groups of children outside the church. This is, in the eyes of the law, an unauthorized public meeting.

In a state where an anti-religious government is the sole employer, the sole dispenser of housing and the sole storekeeper for food and clothing, it requires a high degree of moral courage on the part of parents to sign a certificate demanding religious instruction for their children.

Our Yugoslav children have now gone through ten years in this Communist indoctrination mill which is our school system. The extent of the devastation can hardly be fathomed. No wishful thinking that the Christian home is able to neutralize the corrosive impact of Communist poison upon the mind and heart of youth should blind us to the fact that, with every year that passes, the number of future godless homes increases and that, after not so many more years, the virus of Communist materialism will have killed the spiritual in the majority of the fathers and mothers of tomorrow.

A FREE PRESS

4. The religious press is free, it is said, and copies of religious magazines are shown to visitors.

Before the war, the Catholic press was strong, with four Catholic dailies, many weeklies and monthlies, a considerable number of professional periodicals, artistic and scientific reviews and publishing co-operatives. These distributed yearly among the people hundreds of thousands of books. I myself was editor of a Cath-

olic daily published by a Catholic co-operative which owned and operated the largest printing and publishing plant in the country. It employed over 500 people.

What is left of the Catholic press or, for that matter, of the Christian press? Only monthly church bulletins, printed on 4 to 6 pages of reduced format, with a circulation ceiling of 1,000 copies each. These are allowed to print only announcements of church services and strictly religious texts, such as Epistles or Gospels, with comments which cannot be interpreted as anti-regime or as spreading religious propaganda. That is all the Christians of Yugoslavia call their own today.

No books are printed outside the Communist press because of the paper "shortage." None can be had from abroad without government license, which is never given for Christian publishers. Even missals sent from the United States have "not arrived."

At the same time the press of the regime, tightly controlled and centrally directed by the most trusted Communists, freely pours out, day after day, the most abominable attacks upon religion. There is sacrilegious derision of God, the Sacraments and Our Blessed Lady; slandering of priests, Bishops and the Holy Father; assaults on the most sacred religious traditions. None may contradict, none can counteract these assaults; none may defend the truth.

The Communist censor is there to see to it that no protests of the injured party may ever disturb the silence of freedom of religion.

PERSECUTION OF BISHOPS AND PRIESTS

I have not mentioned the two Bishops who have died in jail, nor those two others who still languish in confinement, among them the Primate himself, Cardinal Stepinac, nor the numerous priests killed outright in their homes or in the open, nor those sent to forced labor, or beaten up by mobs. I have passed over in silence that *all* religious houses have been confiscated and the religious, men and women alike, dispersed, with the exception of a few aged ones who are allowed to die in their habits.

I have passed over in silence the flourishing network of Catholic organizations, economic and cultural, all disbanded, and their properties gone to strengthen the Communist machine.

But, as I said at the beginning, statistics matter little in the panorama of the vast destruction going on behind the Communist Curtain. Bishops and priests and religious will be replaced when freedom returns. The destroyed churches will be rebuilt and new houses will be found to shelter the ministers of the church and the self-sacrificing nuns. New crucifixes will be carved once more to decorate our schools and the presses will again

be set rolling to print the word of God and to explain the Christian way of life as before. Uprooted farmers will return to their homesteads and the hungry will be fed from the resources of the free world.

It will take one generation or more to revive the murdered souls of the young, if it be God's Will that they be ever revived. It will take decades to re-implant the love of the spiritual in soil ravaged by the Communist materialist flood.

This thought carries my memory back to seminary years when an enlightened professor of Church History told us to learn from history that no people, no nation, that has

once lost its faith, is known ever to have recovered it. This is a frightening thought. The vast expanses of once-Catholic Asia Minor, the Middle East and North Africa are silent witnesses to the truth of this statement and a piercing warning of the impending threat.

May the silent struggle of the souls behind the Curtain of Death awaken the consciences of Christians in the free world and arouse them to *act*—to act in the solidarity of the one fold of the children of God, so that God in His Mercy may shorten the trials and spare the Church of Christ the sorrow of having to bewail her children that are no more.



That Sunday Suit

What ever became of the Sunday suit? Not so many years ago, most people saved their best garments for Sunday, reserving their second-best for weekdays. Now, many have reversed the order. Their best clothing is donned on weekdays, and Sunday finds them in castoffs, or at least in so-called casual wear.

The change reflects our higher living standards today, we suppose. It could also indicate the tendency to forget that Sunday is a holy day. It is possible to be holy in rags, of course, but we believe it is more than a coincidence that the Sunday suit and Sunday observance are both becoming less popular.

At any rate, Sunday is losing its stature as the Lord's day. As the Holy Father remarked in his Christmas address, Sunday no longer has "its unique dignity as the day devoted to the worship of God and to physical and spiritual rest for the individual and the family."

The Church is not wedded to all the customs that grew up around the old-fashioned Sunday, and certainly Catholicism has never been sympathetic to the Puritanical blue laws that once made Sunday as dreary as it was holy. But it would be well if we retained enough of these old customs to remind us of the spiritual significance of the first day of the week.—THE FLORIDA CATHOLIC, St. Augustine, Florida, Feb. 12, 1954.

Working Wives

FRAWLEY HYNES

Reprinted from COLUMBIA*

WE ENTER this controversial arena with our guard up, so to speak; and with no desire to criticize. For it would be foolish to try to cut every pattern from the same cloth. But the question—should women work at remunerative jobs after marriage?—is indeed a debatable one; one very tangibly with us and not to be put aside lightly.

Our great-grandmothers would have stiffened with horror at the idea of women leaving home and family to work abroad; yet, in less than fifty years, the scales of custom have tipped so completely that many a grandmother of today is an energetic and efficient part of politics, office, or factory; store, school or hospital. At the same time she maintains her home and is active in church and school affairs.

And most of them are content.

Whether or not they are happier than the *grand dame* of yesteryear, who was wont to sit by the hearth day in, day out, year following year, patching, knitting, quilting—who automatically slipped into a prepared niche and was considered old at fifty-five . . . here is a moot question.

Certain it is that the grandmother of today is not considered old at sixty or even seventy. If her health and faculties are good, she is almost as active as her grand-daughters, And proud of it.

No doubt the elongated life span, brought about by medical science, has contributed much to this hush-to-haste alteration. And, of course, the last hustling, bustling decades with their wars and trends have energized woman and brought forward her natural assertiveness and capabilities. Like a painter dipping her brush in a variety of colors, she adds her skillful strokes to the vivid and realistic picture of the present-day world.

But, coming back to the original query, is it really wise for young women to work after marriage, since marriage implies, or should imply, the arts of homemaking, wifehood and motherhood? Here is where the controversy actually begins. One side insists a double paycheck is imperative in this high-cost-of-living age; that a wife's paycheck spells security

* New Haven 10, Conn., March, 1954

and independence for her; that settling down to house-keeping can come later; that children will be welcome, but later on; that one's talents should be exploited for the public good. And so on. The other side asserts that children are the ties that help make a marriage stable; that it is better to bring up a family frugally, if necessary, so long as the mother bides at home; that personal independence becomes, after marriage, family independence; that wedlock is a giving-up of little and taking-on of much, and is a job in itself that should not be rivaled by another. And, again, so on.

It is not to be denied that wars and the threats of wars have thrust thousands of women into jobs outside the home, whether they would or no. But we cannot deny the fact there are many who work, regardless; either because they have no children, or want no children; or because they enjoy an outside life, or are used to it, or want the extra money for luxuries, or are just ambitious.

HUB OF THE FAMILY

Sitting snug and smug by our own fireside, but trying to be objective, we find it simple to agree with the oft-stated platitude that "women must make a choice between a career and a home." On the one hand, financial independence, but service to strangers; on the other, less of luxury, but service to one's own. No fallacy is it that a woman seldom, if ever, can handle both jobs successfully, for her interests are too sharply divided. One is almost sure to suffer. Especially does it seem unwise to leave children to hired care unless it is absolutely necessary, for the mother is the hub of the family and, if the hub does not turn, well-oiled and in the right direction, how can the spokes? Day-by-day separation is far from the ideal way of caring for a family, which has been given by God as both a gift and a duty.

The average bride of today is, we believe, content to exchange her job for a husband, home and motherhood. She puts aside the old impersonal routine for the new and the personal. She directs her energies to home-making and the care of children, accepting with real pleasure this admirable way of life, this method of working out her salvation.

In the home she becomes partner as well as wife, companion as well as mother, lady as well as servant, custodian of young lives as well as their source. What more can woman, born of woman, desire?

Nor need, nor should marriage quell, frustrate or destroy her innate, her cultivated talents. No writer, painter, musician, designer, teacher or nurse should allow her abilities to stagnate, for they are God-given and

should find expression. Indeed, they will find expression, and in the best sense, through the medium of family life.

Going back to grandmothers, even while one admires the modern busy-as-a-bee category, one must be a little nostalgic for the old-fashioned rocking chair type that nodded by the fire with beads in one hand, knitting in the other, and gentle spirit already poised on the last starry step.



Today's Moral Problem

It is common for critics to maintain that the moral problem of today is that of bringing the "intellectual and moral level" of modern man up to the level of his material knowledge and achievement. There is, however, a suitable perversion of outlook implicit in this statement. It presents the dilemma in such a way that *the vision of material progress* is still in the center of the picture—man must be morally "streamlined" so that his nature may be harmonized with the new world order required by the advance of technics. This particular error of "*belittling the Creator and His work*" and "*pronouncing human nature a defective product*" on the ground of limitations which interfere with the fulfillment of technological projects, is noted for condemnation in the Christmas Message. The Holy Father shows that the monstrous, anti-human development threatened by the expansion of technics is not due simply to natural human deficiencies, but to a particular error in the direction of the human intelligence along the lines indicated in the poet's cry: "*Glory to Man in the highest—for Man is the Master of Things.*"

Salvation, therefore, is not to be achieved by a secularist plan for building a new moral order by a process of social conditioning, any more than by the energy of productivity to create a higher living standard—an illusion which the Pope aptly compares with the vision of cosmic salvation through Free Trade a century ago.—THE ADVOCATE, Melbourne, Australia, Jan. 14, 1954.

Cana and the American Parish

THE REV. GEORGE A. KELLY

*Address to the Eastern Cana Institute, New York, N. Y.,
September 30, 1953.*

THE spiritual vigor of the American Church usually surprises no one who has a first-hand acquaintance with parish life in the United States. The throngs that fill our church buildings Mass after Mass each week have been a source of pride for American priests, edification for European visitors and wonderment to our non-Catholic neighbors. So much construction of churches and schools is still going on, so many conversions are being reported annually, that the more timorous native Protestants are beginning to wonder how long America will remain Protestant.

Regardless of this optimism there has always been a school of Catholic thought — usually linked with the names of Shaughnessy, Coakley, Ross — which took a dimmer view of Catholic accomplishments in the United States.

These critics were not content with the expansion of parish plants nor even with the 100,000 converts claimed for the American Church yearly. Very many of these converts, they point out, were acquired on the occasion of marriage or included many thousands who merely returned

to the Faith of their ancestors after the apostasy of a parent or grandparent. These priests, while proud of our successes, were more alarmed by the leakage from Peter's Barque and were somewhat dismayed that the Church in America, after a century and a half, had not been really effective in converting the Indian, the Negro, the Bible Belt of the South, or the Yankees of New England. American parishes were said to be losing as fast as they gained and, whatever glory they may claim for preserving the Faith in the faithful, certainly failed to do first-class missionary work among non-Catholics or even successfully to reclaim lost Catholic sheep within their territories.

The validity of this rather critical hypothesis can be tested only in the light of the history of American parishes and through the use of better Catholic statistics than are now available.

It is unquestionable, however, that American parishes in those regions of the United States where Catholics abound have never been missionary-minded in the sense that Abbé Michonneau would define the term

"missionary." One could hardly expect them to be. The parishes of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago and now Los Angeles have never had to develop and grow as the parishes of Raleigh and Charleston still must. Most of the parishes in these great Catholic centers were ready-made for pastors and priests by the waves of immigrants that covered metropolitan areas between 1870 and 1920. Natural increase in population took care of the rest.

The quality, extent and timing of this immigration conditioned the whole sacramental and social life of American parishes thereafter. The methods of pastoral care invented to meet this problem have dictated the routine of priests even to this day.

PRESERVATION OF THE FAITH

The basic aim of the American Church in the face of these millions of Catholic immigrants was to preserve the Faith of the faithful and their children. The foreign-born, who filled out old parishes and forced the creation of new ones, were basically Christian people. If they did not always have high standards of religious observance, and most of the Irish and German immigrants did, at least they possessed a culture and a family life that was Catholic to the core. The energies of the Church were directed toward getting them to Mass and the Sacraments, educating their children and, where there was

a language barrier, protecting them against discrimination and persecution. There was not always agreement among churchmen as to how this might best be done.

By the very nature of the case American priests were most immediately concerned with Catholics, and indeed with the good Catholics. So many Catholics moved into these urban neighborhoods that matters could hardly have been otherwise. The building and financing of parish plants and the operation of parochial schools ranked second in importance in the life of a busy pastor after the administration of the Sacraments.

Under such circumstances the priest, hub and center of immigrant life in America, did yeoman work but he did it almost without help. Once the nuns took over the school system, most of the educational and social work of the parish passed out of his hands. (The long-range result of this transfer is that some convents are more influential in communities than are the rectories.) However, in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries the priest, following his European prototype, performed all the corporal and spiritual works of mercy himself. He visited the sick, sought employment for his nationals, saved the jobs of others, protected wives against drunken husbands, drove children off the street at night. In knowing and serving his people such a priest had little help from anyone.

This period about which we are speaking antedated the breakdown of family social life and the secularization of recreation. Much of the parish year was given over to smokers, dances, minstrels and Irish-night shows. So recreational did the non-sacramental life of the parish become that Catholics grew up to look to their pastor as much for entertainment as for spiritual uplift. The recreational point of view still dominates most American parish societies. These societies, which reached their full bloom between 1900 and 1930, always separated men from women and had for their primary object the corporate reception of monthly Communion, a tribute to the leadership of Pius X and his ideal of frequent Communion. As far as the practising Catholics are concerned, these efforts have been richly rewarded by our presently congregated altar rails.

A SOCIAL FORCE

The historic American parish was much more than the local ecclesiastical unit of the Church. It was a dominant social force in the community. The pastor was the guardian and protector of Christian morals. He was influential enough to preserve for a time old-country customs, particularly as they related to the practice of the faith. It was through the parish that the foreign-born were educated in the American way of life. This power was a natural by-product of

the social organization of the times.

In many ways the American parish still operates within its traditional framework. The building program of the American church is far from completed. Her priests still work almost exclusively with the "saved." A great part of parochial activity, perhaps most of it, is still of the recreational variety, and all of its societies, save the Cana Movement, are divided male and female. Adult education represents only a small part of American Catholic education. The Catholic Action Movement is still in its infant stage in the United States. The priest, while not the dominant community figure he once was, still does too much of the parish work himself, even if it be calling numbers at a bingo game or supervising a roller skating party.

Now there is little question among priests who bridge two generations—those who grew up in immigrant neighborhoods and who have spent their parish priesthood among modern home-grown Catholics—that conditions are not now what they once were. The rich piety of the foreign-born is not common today among the sophisticated Catholics of a double postwar generation. Even when the contemporary urban Catholic has a good record of religious observance, he is not as close to his parish as his father and grandfather were. This is not everywhere true but it is generally true. The new Catholic in metropoli-

tan and suburban areas is a stranger to his parish. He is lost in the wilderness of urban anonymity and, if he be lukewarm, lax or apostate, he is content to remain lost. His priest is not sure how lost he is, and his good Catholic neighbors (conforming to the urban way of life) have been taught to mind their own business and to do nothing to reclaim him for the Church. Modern paganism joined with this anonymity fills out the distressing picture that faces every zealous parish priest today.

In the jungle of modern city life it is easy for moral evils and religious aberrations to multiply at a rate that would hardly have been possible forty years ago. No priest in close contact with any metropolitan parish can fail to be disturbed by the large number of invalid marriages, the proneness of weak Catholic couples to separate or divorce for reasons their parents would have thought puerile, the ease with which traditionally Catholic people stop raising families or stop attending Mass. These sinners are no longer on the defensive, save psychologically. They have succeeded, with the help of our pagan culture, in putting the saints on the defensive. And their ignorance of and lack of sympathy with the social teaching of the Church is appalling.

The structure of parish life could hardly remain unaffected throughout these changes. There are fewer active

workers in most parishes today and an increasing number of parishioners who do not want to be bothered. The parish as "community," with the great loyalties it had among people, is in danger of passing. As a result the influence of the pastor, even over the morals of the neighborhood, is declining. A strong pastor resists this trend for a time but the strong pastors of forty years ago are fewer now. There is much more criticism of pastoral rule and by virtue of the proximity of churches much more inclination to rebel with impunity against a fixed parish regimen. To further weaken the bond between parish and people, a host of agencies has been developed to stand between priest and people, most of which are secular and political in nature. Where does the average Catholic turn today in time of trouble? He has many places to go besides his parish and he takes advantage of this freedom.

NEW STRATEGY NEEDED

The Church today — the parish church included—lives in a hostile environment. No parish any longer can be satisfied to be an ark which protects the chosen few against the tempest. Pastors must develop a strategy of penetration into the pagan culture all around them, together with tactics that will be effective in meeting the needs of this particular age. The complaint is being made that the American parish is adhering

to forms and methods better suited to a previous generation. Since the modern parish is by circumstance serving secularized Catholics, it cannot in conscience continue its traditional mode of operation without some change. However, what is required (as much as a change of techniques) is a change of thinking.

1. The modern metropolitan parish must be *par excellence* a missionary parish. It must devote its major energies to the lost and those being lost. Its emphasis must be on instructing converts, public-school pupils, their parents, young couples, and on an agreeable liturgy and Catholic Action. The missionary parish must be concerned about the invalidly married, the non-Mass attenders, minority groups, the poor. Parish societies, whether joined or separate, male or female, must be known not for their numbers but for their apostolic functioning.

2. The modern parish, under the direction of the pastor and priests, must use to greater advantage its lay members as militant apostles. Lay Catholics can reach into segments of the parish no priest can reach. If properly alive to their faith and adequately trained, these laymen will do more good by their quiet moral life and simple conviction than a priest's sermon. In other days of religious crisis the Church turned to a new religious order or congregation, whether it be Jesuit, Dominican or

Premonstratensian. Today the Popes tell priests to turn to their laity as the vanguard of Catholicism in a pagan world. It is all the more to be pitied that some pastors can find no more for their laity to do than to operate money wheels at the annual bazaar.

3. The modern parish must develop a program aimed at adults. The parochial school has been America's greatest contribution to the Universal Church. But it has made us too child-minded. It used to be said that the Church could rest secure if it had the opportunity to educate its children. That was valid enough when the child entered the parochial school from a Christian home and graduated into a more or less Christian world. Catholic education is no longer enough when the home, as well as the world, is pagan. It is the experience of some parish priests that many Catholic adults are pagan in spite of previous Catholic education. Some well-schooled Catholic boys and girls cannot make the transition from pious childhood religion to secularized adult life. Many children are in parochial schools for purposes of discipline, convenience, refinement rather than religion.

All this proves the obvious, of course, that the home is still, and always will be, the dominant educative force. If birth prevention, divorce, juvenile delinquency, materialism, social amorality are found even

among Catholic high school graduates, the rechristianization of the family and of married couples must not take second place in a parish to the education of children. The parish priests must reinterpret the Gospel message for adults beset by modern problems in terms that they could not be expected to understand or appreciate during their high school years. Adult education, particularly for the married and workers, must loom larger in the parish program of the future than it has in the past.

4. The modern parish must be liturgy-minded. Some devils can be driven out only by prayer and fasting, and no prayer is more equipped than the social prayer of the Church. The movement towards lay interest and participation in the Mass and the Sacraments is still moving too slowly. Recited Masses, community sung Masses, participated administration of Baptism are more common than they were years ago and all to the good. However, there is still much to be done. American parishes suffer in this one respect from the domination of their early formation by Irish priests who through no fault of their own were not liturgical-minded. More worthy of imitation was the German tradition calling for active participation by the congregation, even in High Masses. As it is, the "quiet" Mass is too much a part of typical parish *mores* to be uprooted easily. Our churches, particularly the older

ones, make cooperative prayer difficult because of their size, shape and poor acoustics. Whatever the preliminary difficulties, however, a liturgical-minded parish has a "togetherness" and prayerfulness that is needed in a secular age which has conquered our people by dividing them.

HOW CANA OPERATES

It is the opinion of many Catholic commentators that one of the best developments in the American Church in this direction has been the growth of the Cana Movement. Originally a French adaptation to married life of Jocist techniques, *Pre-Cana* and *Cana Conferences*, as well as the *Christian Family Movement*, have had wide appeal and considerable grass-root success among American Catholics. It would not be surprising to find this movement becoming within twenty years a dominant part of parish life everywhere.

Pre-Cana (for the engaged couple) and Cana Conferences (for the married couple) are usually conducted by a priest, a Catholic doctor, and/or married couple. These three- to four-hour sessions, spent in a friendly and informal atmosphere, attempt to create enthusiasm for marriage as well as to outline the Christian solution for contemporary family problems. This part of Cana is not an attempt to get people back to Church or to the Sacraments. It is more an attempt to make marriage a more

happy experience for the couple who attend and an effort to get the couple to provide a better home for their children. One of the outgrowths of such conferences has been the stimulation of more love and affection in the home and a greater understanding between wife and husband. Many couples have been inspired to new faith in their marriage and have found lost ideals rekindled.

The topics discussed at these meetings range from the husband-wife and parent-child relationship to economic, medical and sex problems in the home.

The afternoon usually ends with a renewal of marriage vows before the exposed Blessed Sacrament and Benediction.

The Christian Family Movement is usually a follow-up to Cana Conferences. Whereas the conferences are intended for the masses of families in a community, CFM deals with a handful of couples. Selected couples following Jocist techniques of observe, judge, act, through fortnightly or monthly meetings in a home, attempt to acquire Christian attitudes toward their own family life and only then try to exert some influence on the family life of their neighbors, relatives and friends. When a section contains more than four or five couples, a new section is usually formed.

The entire Cana Movement, including both types of endeavor, is pecu-

liarily adapted to modern needs and promises to bear much fruit for the American Church.

A PARISH MOVEMENT

One of Cana's most constructive features is the fact that it is a *parish movement*. The parish-mindedness of Cana is vital to its success. The trend of recent times, within the Church as elsewhere, has been toward centralization, even centralization of apostolic efforts in non-parochial institutions. The two institutions basic to Cana are the family and the parish. The parish-centered Cana reaches corners of the Mystical Body no extra-parochial society would or could. Through Cana the parish becomes a vital force in the community. Priests who have made these conferences or section meetings part of normal parish life have found the parochial school enrollment growing, parents of public school children interested for the first time in what goes on, converts and validated marriages on the increase, and Catholics being reintroduced to the intimate life of the parish.

Of its very nature Cana is a *family movement*. It begins the work of rechristianization right where it ought to begin—at the family level. One good couple effectively moulds entire generations of Christian people. Many apostates and excommunicates, not to mention the lax and the lukewarm, can trace their original fall

from grace and the Sacraments to a bad Catholic mother or father or both. Parish priests expend much energy putting religious patches on the souls of erring individuals whose spiritual mechanism was never manufactured right in the first place. Cana is much more sensible in that it works on the home itself and on the creation of proper Christians from the beginning. However, far from taking over any duties of the parents, a tendency all too evident in modern society, this movement makes parents more responsible.

Cana has also the advantage of being a *religious movement*. One of the most irritating aspects of parish life for interested parish priests and zealous Catholic laymen is the more than frequent involvement in activities that are almost completely secularized. No one, however, need have any fear about Cana Conferences or the CFM. Participants in these enterprises are devoted exclusively and completely to instructing and inspiring married couples.

What is most important for these times, Cana is a *lay movement*. It creates and simultaneously takes advantage of religious zeal among the faithful. The couples run the entire affair, from getting the couples to participate to serving coffee and cake. The priest is restricted to the role of teacher and guardian, specific priestly functions, while the lay people assume in the parish an apostolic func-

tion of their own. Modern secularism can best be fought by those who are affected most by it. Cana is a magnificent form of the lay apostolate and a fine outlet for lay apostolic instincts.

Cana is also an *adult movement*. While child-centered education is probably more important and certainly is the type of instruction emphasized by the Church Universal, there is a great need today of adult education. Formalized school training is aimed at children or adolescents who have not yet experienced the major temptations of secularized life and who frequently cannot successfully view modern living in the light of their childhood knowledge of the Faith. Cana directs its informative energies toward the state of life most affected by paganism and an age group still subject to influence. Sometimes the best Catholics are not the new converts, as is frequently claimed, but the reconverted fallen-aways, who appreciate their Faith as they never did in childhood.

CATHOLIC ACTION

Because Cana provides an apostleship of like to like, it can be called a *Catholic Action* movement. While it is true that a minority of couples in the parish do most of the work and supply most of the enthusiasm, Cana, following the mind of Pius XI, is intended to influence and possibly convert the masses of couples in an

area to the worthwhileness of Christian marriage and to create an atmosphere in the parish favorable to such marriage. For that reason both the conferences and the CFM appeal to all kinds of couples, Catholic, non-Catholic and mixed, validly and invalidly married, good and bad, young and middle-aged, white and non-white, poor and rich. Indeed, special efforts should be made to see that all classes in the parish are represented in the movement.

For many reasons Cana is a *popular movement*, not the least of which is the fact that it takes advantage of the natural desire of people for happiness and the normal interest spouses have in their own marriage. Yet its popularity has a wider base. In people there is a natural instinct to share happiness or prosperity with others. The very fact that Cana is a *social movement* makes it popular. People are brought together in a congenial atmosphere to promote their own common well-being. This sociability offsets the impression commonly felt that no one lives a Christian married life any more and is a counter-offensive to the social pressures which induce Catholic people to sin against their marriage.

The steady extension of Cana Conferences across the country is further explainable by the fact that it is a *personal movement*, which spreads and grows, not by the persuasiveness of anything written about

it, certainly not by use of salesmanship techniques, but by the time-tested and highly human method of personal contact.

Finally, Cana is an *educational movement* in the best sense of the phrase since it promotes the best kind of education by example and companionship. It partakes of the genius of Christianity, which is charity, and it is an *effective movement* because, apart from any long-range benefits and independent of its leavening influence in pagan society, it has immediate practical advantages for the couples who are part of it.

APPROACHING THE PROBLEM

The proposition that time-tested and customary methods of parish administration should be transformed or supplanted is sometimes deemed offensive by veteran priests. The suggested changes of thinking and acting imply criticism of the *status quo* and experienced priests are quick to resent these criticisms, particularly if given by inexperienced men or in an uncharitable way. Priests, being people, love what they know and hold on to what is their own. They are naturally resistant to changes unless they can be convinced beforehand that the change represents growth. Particularly in this era, as pastors continue to increase in age, a more conservative approach to parish administration is common. Progress, if it does not come from

the young, comes most frequently from the young-minded, who are willing to risk innovation and overcome the dangers and difficulties of new approaches. However, the cause of parish reform is not helped along by smart-aleck young priests who imagine they have all the answers.

The long-range problem of adjusting parish life to modern needs will necessarily involve some experimentation and an interchange of ideas among working parish priests. At present there are no professional meetings or conventions of parish priests which relate to the practicalities of their priesthood, even though Catholic teachers and social workers find value in such regularized conferences. Seminary training of future parish priests is too often unrelated to the type of life and kind of problems these men will meet after ordination, without inspired and competent training in contemporary trends.

The young priest will soon settle down to a routine determined for him by his elders and accept uncritically, from a spirit of obedience,

the techniques of a former generation of priests. Yet in many dioceses and parishes, there is an atmosphere conducive to some kind of originality and experiment. The papal documents of the past thirty years give ample encouragement to pastors and bishops in permitting this leeway. More advantage could be taken of this guided freedom.

Bossuet said: "The Church of Christ is always new, because the Spirit Who is in her soul is always new." The immortal youthfulness of the Church is manifested in the interest of the Suhards, the Michonneaus, the Heenans, the Treses in the transformation of parish life. In the local area the parish is Christ. It is as vital to the Mystical Body of Christ as the family is to the child. Nothing—neither lay retreats, labor schools, Newman clubs, not even parochial schools—is an adequate substitute for a vital parish. To this end the efforts of parish priests all over the world are humbly dedicated and the hopes for revitalized parish life are enkindled.



Telling More Than Time

A man with a pocket watch retains his sense of values and is not recreant to tradition. It's a sign that he loves punctuality. He does not give in to frills and foibles. There is something substantial to a man, or rather a gentleman, who has to pause a second, pull forth his watch and announce the time of day. You have a feeling his time is correct, that it is in tune with Greenwich.—THE SOUTHWEST COURIER, *Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Feb. 13, 1954.*

Religious Critics of the U.N.

VERY REV. MSGR. GEORGE G. HIGGINS

*Address to the Conference on U.S. Responsibility for World Leadership,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1954.*

"THEOLOGIANs, like metaphysicians," an English friar observes in a recent treatise on political philosophy, "are particularly susceptible to the attractions of what has been called the linotype school of history. They can easily be found to argue, like a Cobdenite or a Marxist, that if certain ideas are applied, these are bound to produce certain results. If all men served justice there would be no social problems—if free trade were adopted the world would be economically balanced and stable—both arguments impose an hypothesis after much the same fashion." This method, he continues, is legitimate but only within limits.

It would be fair to say, I think, that these limits have long since been exceeded by some of the more vocal critics of the United Nations or, more precisely, by those particular critics of the United Nations who seem to argue from the hidden premise that international order can be established and international peace maintained as a sort of automatic byproduct of individual moral reform or by the automatic application, in an institutional vacuum, of abstract principles of

morality, or, to put it another way, which comes to substantially the same thing, by the ideal implementation of disembodied moral principles in an ideal world organization. Few of these critics are theologians or metaphysicians properly so-called. On the contrary, the record will show that professional theologians and metaphysicians, or at least the official religious organizations of the United States, have been eminently realistic in their appraisal of the United Nations and in many instances have publicly endorsed it, not indeed as a perfect organization, but as a step, a very important step, in the right direction.

Official religious pronouncements to the contrary notwithstanding, however, many thousands of religious-minded men and women in the United States give the appearance at the present time of being extremely cynical about the United Nations. Assuming, as I think we must, that the majority of these people, the professional demagogues excluded, are men and women of reasonable good-will, acting upon reasonably worthy motives, we would do more harm than

good, in my opinion, if we were to try to shame them out of their cynicism and their attitude of defeatism by the lazy rhetorical device of branding all of them indiscriminately as benighted or reactionary isolationists. It might be added, by way of parenthesis which could easily be expanded into a full-length treatise by a competent theologian, that arguments or slogans derived from the philosophy of secularism are also calculated to do more harm than good to the cause of the United Nations. Nineteenth-century rationalism helped to create many of the problems of the twentieth century, but it can hardly be depended upon to solve them. Logical positivism is unequal to the almost superhuman task of driving out the devil which made its appearance in a fiery cloud of smoke over Hiroshima and Nagasaki almost ten years ago.

INTERNATIONAL ETHICS

What is needed at the present time is a patient attempt to exorcise the evil and enervating spirit of cynicism and defeatism in the field of international relations, not by belittling the importance of religion and the moral law, but by demonstrating to the best of our collective ability the practical impossibility of ever adequately implementing the principles of the moral law at the international level without benefit of an international organization with adequate

legislative, executive and judicial powers. This will involve the added and more subtle task of demonstrating that patience is a virtue even in the natural order, that the best is often the enemy of the good, or, to put it another way, that half a loaf is better than no bread at all. It will also involve a sincere effort on the part of all so-called internationalists to make the necessary distinctions between good and bad internationalism and a sincere effort on their part to understand why it is that so many good people are instinctively suspicious of any kind of internationalism. In this connection it may be helpful to quote a couple of paragraphs from the *Code of International Ethics* compiled by the International Union of Social Studies:

The fervent support given by Socialists and Communists to internationalism has greatly helped to discredit both the term and the reality in Catholic circles and not altogether without reason, since internationalism thus patronized implies the suppression of frontiers, the abolition of nationalities, making the world a vast battleground in which a merciless class war will replace national antagonisms. This idea has been a useful instrument of Marxist propaganda, but it is utterly chimerical, since it ignores the natural law of differentiation which will ever continue to endow each nation with special characteristics.

There is another internationalism which we would rather call—if usage allowed—universalism, so as to emphasize the sense in which it complements the particularism of nations.

This type of internationalism does not disdain the very diverse cultural values which distinguish the various national groups and form their heritage. It respects them fully, for it knows their worth. But it goes beyond these contingent aspects of human life to discover and retain as a higher reality that identity of nature which makes all human beings to be members of one family, and all nations the constituent parts of a much vaster, supranational, universal society.

This is neither the time nor the place to embark upon the difficult assignment of convincing the cynics that they are wrong about the U. N. All that we can hope to do in the limited time available is to suggest a few tentative approaches to the subject, with the emphasis on the spiritual, but with no intention of blurring the distinction between the natural law on the one hand and revealed religion on the other.

CHRISTIAN BROTHERHOOD

As a convenient point of departure, I would open the discussion, from the point of view of Catholic theology, with a pertinent quotation from a posthumous treatise by a brilliant young Jesuit who was executed in France by the Gestapo during World War II, Father Yves de Montcheuil, S. J.:

The Christian receives from his Christianity an ideal of universal communion between men, for the communion of each man with God implies the communion of all men in God. God cannot, so to speak, be possessed by each

individual for himself, but only in common. The ideal is realizable only in the hereafter, both in its intimacy and in its extension. But it should begin to take form here below; its beginning has a value, not only as a means to a future realization, but as a preliminary rough draft thereof. . . .

The communion between human beings, a very imperfect good but a very real one, cannot simply be postponed for the beyond. Anyone who desires it (and could one be a Christian without doing so passionately?) will seek to bring it about without delay and will always wish to increase and deepen it. Such an endeavor not only presupposes an effort toward individual understanding, but also the creation of objective conditions which facilitate it. Every factor of hate or discord which divides, which opposes mutual understanding and love, will unceasingly be opposed by the Christian. Everything which may aid in bringing minds and hearts together will be abetted. Therein lies the basis for an untiring activity in the political, economic and social domain which is carried on in this life and which applies directly to the temporal order.

The application of this very pregnant summary of the Christian law of human brotherhood to the field of international relations is, I think, patently, if not transparently, obvious. Father de Montcheuil refers to the necessity of creating whatever objective conditions are necessary to facilitate the application of the universal law of charity. Paramount among these objective conditions is an international organization charged with the responsibility and endowed

with sufficient power, coercive power if necessary, to maintain order and peace in the world community of nations and to give flesh and blood to what would otherwise be vague and ineffective sentiments of human brotherhood.

If it be said by way of rejoinder that the United Nations as presently constituted is not such an organization, those of us who believe in the U. N. would be well advised, in my opinion, to concede the point as gracefully as possible without rancor or embarrassment. We can then go on to remind the critics of the U. N., in the name of political prudence, that the present United Nations, with all its admitted imperfections, is better than nothing and is certainly capable of being perfected as time goes on.

ATTITUDE OF THE BISHOPS

This is the realistic attitude taken by the bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States. They are realists in the best sense of the word—not susceptible to the attractions of the so-called linotype school of history. They are the official guardians and interpreters of the moral law within their jurisdiction, but they do not believe that abstract, disembodied moral principles will automatically or inevitably produce results if applied in a vacuum. They recognize the necessity of institutional reform side by side with individual moral reform,

and they are sufficiently patient to bear manfully with the fact that institutional reform, in the nature of things, is almost inevitably a discouragingly slow process.

A recent commentator, Father Thomas Gilby, of the English Dominicans, has said of St. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest of the scholastic philosophers:

He was a moralist, not a moralizer. As his theology did not extinguish, but protected, profane value, and as his metaphysics acted like an umbrella under which the special sciences could shelter, so his moral science, while postulating the principles, did not dictate the procedure of politics.

The same thing, it seems to me, can rightfully be said, *mutatis mutandis*, about the American bishops with reference to the position they have taken on the subject of world organization. They are moralists, not moralizers. A moralizer is quickly disillusioned and easily tempted to throw the baby out with the bath. The bishops, on the other hand, following the realistic lead of the Holy See, recognize the importance of changing the water, but they are prudently concerned lest the baby—in this case the United Nations—be abandoned in the process. They have refrained, in Father Gilby's terminology, from attempting to dictate the procedure of politics. They have postulated certain moral principles designed to improve and strengthen the United Nations, but they recognize full well that politics,

especially in the virgin territory of international relations, is the art of the possible and that statesmanship, as Father Gilby puts it, "cannot be treated as a mere prolongation of ethics, for it is a quasi-independent art, working in its own proper medium. . . ."

The position of the bishops with regard to the United Nations has been publicly stated several times but never more clearly than it was in their official statement of November 18, 1945, six months after the completion of the U. N. Charter:

Our peace program envisages a world organization of nations. The charter which emerged from the San Francisco Conference, while undoubtedly an improvement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, does not provide for a sound institutional organization of the international society. The Security Council provisions make it no more than a virtual alliance of the great powers for the maintenance of peace. These nations are given a status above the law. Nevertheless, our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. It is better than world chaos. From the provision in the charter for calling a constituent assembly in the future, there comes the hope that in time the defects may be eliminated, that we may have a sound institutional organization of the international community, which will develop not through mere voluntary concessions of the nations, but from the recognition of the rights and duties of the international society.

Charter revision, as recommended by the bishops in the above statement

and as recommended by most of the organizations represented at this conference, is the intelligent *via media* between utopianism on the one hand and cynicism or defeatism on the other. Father John LaFarge, S. J., associate editor of *America*, sees it as a challenge to all intelligent and God-fearing citizens of the United States. "I know of no more challenging opportunity, before it is too late," he says in his recently published autobiography, "for all those who like myself see the need of an adequately juridic and morally based world organization, than to take an active part in the present worldwide deliberations for the proposed revision of the United Nations Charter in 1955."

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

The majority of those who are here this evening will undoubtedly agree with Father LaFarge. On the other hand, it would be a serious mistake to center all of our attention on the political, technical and psychological problems involved in bringing about an adequate revision of the charter. An effort will have to be made simultaneously to dramatize the unspectacular but tremendously important accomplishments and potentialities of the specialized agencies of the U. N., particularly those which are directly concerned with problems of social justice and economic betterment.

The American people, even those

who are currently cynical about the United Nations considered as a purely political instrumentality, are traditionally the very opposite of cynical when they are made aware of problems of human suffering and human misery whether at home or abroad. The cynic has been described facetiously as a man who believes if you cast your bread upon the waters, it will get soggy. The American people, by and large, have traditionally acted upon the opposite belief as propounded in the Scriptures. If anything they have erred on the side of utopianism rather than cynicism in the field of human welfare. They are capable, however, of becoming cynical about the ILO, the FAO, and other specialized agencies of the U. N. because they are not sufficiently aware of the humanitarian work which these organizations are attempting to do. If they knew the facts of the case, there is reason to believe that their native generosity and their religious heritage would incline them to say amen to the encouraging message which Pope Pius XII recently addressed to the delegates attending the seventh session of the FAO:

The civilized world always looks with great sadness at the pitiful picture of hunger victims at a time when the earth is capable of feeding all men. To abolish such an evil once and for all is certainly worth sacrifices and justifies great devotion. Was not Christ careful to satisfy the hunger of the crowds

which followed Him? Did He not teach His disciples a prayer that asks for daily bread? In pursuing the goal which you have set for yourselves you are undoubtedly seeking an end dear to Him who consecrated Himself to the salvation of humanity. That is why we want you to go on with your work without faltering. It is without question only at its beginning, but you have already learned a great deal from experience. The tools with which you work are being improved and your prestige is increasing among governments who appreciate more and more the usefulness and the fruits of your activities. If the final goal is not yet in sight, you can at least hope that a greater understanding and a more active cooperation will come to reinforce and multiply the results already obtained and to guarantee more rapid progress in the future.

CORPORAL WORKS OF MERCY

What the Holy Father was saying, in effect, is that the FAO and other specialized agencies of the U. N. working in related fields of human welfare are a very important, if not an indispensable means of carrying out the corporal works of mercy in the spirit of the Gospel under twentieth-century conditions. His emphasis on the spiritual aspects of the U. N. and his unflagging spirit of Christian optimism in the face of many discouragements should serve to dispel the fearful misgivings of many religious-minded men and women who, with the best of goodwill, have ironically, but let us hope only temporarily, become cynical about the United Nations in the name

of abstract disembodied moral principles.

When all is said and done, however, no amount of logical argumentation, even if backed up to the hilt by authoritative quotations from the highest religious sources, will ever convince the people of this country or any other country to support the objectives of this conference. Something much more fundamental is required. "Unless the Lord builds the house, he labors in vain who builds it." I conclude, therefore, as I probably should have begun, by reciting a prayer for peace which was composed in 1942 by one whose entire life has been dedicated to the cause of international understanding, His Holiness Pope Pius XII:

"Doing penance, then, and supplicating with humble soul, let all—and

especially the innocent boys and girls—ask of the Divine Redeemer and His most holy Mother that, while sky and sea are daily more convulsed with the flashing storm, light from on high may shine before us who are sailing at the helm of the mystical ship, and that heavenly aid may be with us; that to the wretched and starving, the needed food of soul and body may be supplied; that to exiles, their fatherland may be restored; to the wounded and sick, health; to prisoners, freedom; and that lastly to the whole human race, its evil desires being tamed by reason, and the right order of justice and charity toward God and neighbor being restored, Christian peace, which is true peace, both in the private life of each and in civil society, may at last be established."



Don't Forget the Martyrs

Europe is far from the Caribbean, and the persecution of the Church behind the Iron Curtain may seem almost unreal to us. But we know that it is very real to those undergoing the "dry martyrdom" of these times. Outstanding among them is Cardinal Mindszenty, one of the most courageous figures in the history of the Church. Let us pray for him today and throughout the Marian Year that his courage may not fail and that he may persevere to the end of his bitter trial. Let us pray, too, for the millions who suffer with him as witnesses to Christ and to the Church He founded on earth.—CATHOLIC OPINION, *Kingston, Jamaica, Feb. 14, 1954.*

Franciscans and the Beard

JOSEPH SMETANA, O. F. M. CAP.

*Reprinted from ROUND TABLE OF FRANCISCAN RESEARCH**

ARTISTS in the centuries following the death of St. Francis seem to have tried to rival one another in portraying him in unusual localities, a variety of habits and at different periods of his life. Yet in all these portraits they are remarkably consistent: they show the Poverello with a beard. His first biographer, Thomas of Celano, even included in his description of St. Francis the fact that "his lips were small and fine, his beard dark and thin." Matthew of Paris adds that it was "an uncultivated beard." Today the claim that St. Francis wore a beard is no longer seriously contested, and people have grown used to seeing him pictured with one.

Although the laity regularly wore the beard, the custom of shaving among the clergy of the Latin Church was well established before the lifetime of St. Francis. This tradition had been in existence from the time of the first preaching of the Christian doctrine in Rome, where the Roman emperors and the Roman citizens in general were in the habit of shaving their beards. The early Roman clergy also adopted this practice. The com-

ing of the Barbarians put an end to the custom among the people, but it was kept up by the Roman emperors and the clergy. In other parts of the continent the Roman element disappeared at the invasion of the Goths, who wore beards and reintroduced the custom to the people. The clergy, for a time, followed their example, but then returned to the time-honored practice of shaving. As time passed, shaving of the beard came to be considered a part of the ecclesiastical tonsure along with the shaving of the head in the form of a crown. A canon of the Council of Bourges, held in 1031, reads: "They shall have the ecclesiastical tonsure, that is, the beard cut and the corona on the head."

Even earlier than this Council, shaving the beard had become a distinctive mark to distinguish the clergy from the laity, who had retained the beard. It also helped to remind the clergy of the sanctity of their calling and of the purity of the life such a calling required. The fact that shaving was a distinguishing mark for the clergy is given by William of Malmesbury when he relates that the Anglo-Saxons thought William the

* St. Anthony Friary, Marathon, Wis., October, 1953

Conqueror's army consisted of priests because his soldiers were shaved. St. Adalbert, a bishop and martyr of the last half of the tenth century, suggested to his clergy that they disguise themselves by letting their beards grow in order to be better received by the barbarians they intended to convert.

Since all the clergy were not consistent in the practice of shaving, a number of Councils published decrees to enforce the custom. By the 11th century shaving was no longer considered a custom that could be easily changed but was a well established law. In 1119, the Council of Toulouse ordained that "If any person who is marked so as to be known to enjoy the distinction of being a member of the Church's army, monk, canon, or any cleric at all, invalidates his first profession, returns to the world, or lets his hair and beard grow as does a layman, let him be removed from the communion of the Church until he makes suitable reparation for his violation of duty." Later, other Councils also treated of the cutting of the beard and corona, and among these were the Councils of Avignon in 1337, of London in 1342, and that of the Lateran in 1514. Shaving thus had become the established tradition in the Latin Church.

When the religious orders arose, the monks also took to shaving off the beard. Various monks have written against the beard, including St.

Jerome and St. Augustine in the 5th century, St. Columban in the 6th century, who obliged his deacons to shave under pain of six lashes, and St. Peter Damian in the 11th century.

ST. FRANCIS AND THE BEARD

Thus it was that when St. Francis founded his Order, the wearing of the beard was contrary to the practice of the clergy, but not to that of the people. Bishop Seghers says that, "When St. Francis and his companions applied to Innocent III for the approbation of their rule, they were denied that favor, and one of the causes was, according to Matthew of Paris, their long beards: 'Prolixa barba.'" However, while it is true that Matthew of Paris does not present St. Francis as a very pleasant picture, relating that he had "an ill-made habit, a despicable countenance, a long beard and uncombed hair, which was black and hanging over the eyebrows," the point that Innocent III really objected to was Francis' idea of poverty. St. Bonaventure tells the story of how Innocent first turned Francis away with disdain, and then was converted by a dream. After Cardinal John won the case for St. Francis, the Cardinal gave the friars the clerical tonsure.

There have been many arguments raised to prove that St. Francis did not wear a beard. One example of these declares: "As to the beard, we know that the first brethren shaved,

but we may gather from their mode of life that they cannot have done so with any great regularity. The custom of letting the beard grow appeared at first a regrettable innovation. St. Francis himself condemned it on one occasion, and Fra Salimbene reproached Elias with having let this abuse become established during his term as General." This argument is already partly answered in the words, "we may gather from their mode of life that they cannot have done so with any great regularity," for St. Francis, besides his missionary journeys, spent long periods in retreat in the mountains. As for St. Francis condemning the beard, it would be more correct to say that he neither prescribed nor forbade the beard, but rather condemned the spirit of vanity that was behind a daintily-trimmed beard.

The motives for Francis' wearing the beard are not definitely known. Outstanding among those which we can reasonably conceive is his love for the literal imitation of Christ. He no doubt also wore the beard out of humility, as a check on vanity and self-love. However, it does not seem that the Poverello required his followers to wear the beard as a matter of principle.

As we look at St. Francis through the eyes of the painters that pictured him in the 13th and 14th centuries, we find that he is bearded. In the three oldest pictures of St. Francis,

two of them painted before his death and the other in 1236, he has a beard. Some have objected that Giotto, in his paintings of St. Francis in the Basilica at Assisi, has him portrayed without a beard. Giotto, however, was not an historic artist, but a mystic one. In the same Basilica there are also pictures by Giotto which show the Poverello with a beard, such as the ones which depict St. Francis speaking to the birds and his receiving the stigmata. Later artists continued the practice of portraying Francis with a beard, not only to show his similarity to Christ, but also because they were convinced he had one.

The Franciscan Order gradually became an Order of clerics or priests and already by 1232 the brothers were in a minority. The Chapter of 1239 reduced the number of lay-brothers for the future still more and deprived them of all share in the government of the Order. The beard thus no doubt disappeared with the brothers.

Later among the secular clergy there arose an interest in the beard. This is probably due to Julius II (1503-1513), who was the first Pope to wear a beard. Twenty-four of his successors, until the time of Clement XI (1700-1721), followed his example. Only two, Leo XI (1605) and Adrian VI (1522-1523), did not wear the beard. It was only natural for the clergy to imitate the Popes.

The Franciscan Constitutions in 1508 for the first time prescribed that "The friars ('fratres') shall not grow their hair nor their beard," although this was contrary to the Pope's practice. At the same time, this shows that the beard was still worn, at least at times, by the Franciscans.

CAPUCHINS AND THE BEARD

Matthew of Bascio, the actual originator of the Capuchin reform, chose to wear a beard out of his desire to imitate St. Francis perfectly. Since Francis wore the beard in imitation of Christ and out of humility, Matthew wore it, too. These same motives prompted Ludovico and Raphael Fossombrone, through the Duchess of Camerino, to ask for papal permission to wear the beard. Some historians have maintained that the custom of wearing the beard by these two and all later Capuchins was due to the influence of the Camaldolese monks. It is difficult to say just how greatly they were influenced, for the wearing of the beard was the practice of the times and, moreover, the Capuchins intended to lead an eremitical life, of which the beard was a symbol. Pope Clement VII in the Bull, *Religionis Zelus*, on July 3, 1528, declared:

To you who desire, for the salvation of souls and the glory of God, to lead the hermit's life and so far as human frailty permits to observe the Rule of the blessed Francis, yielding to your supplication We grant you by Our Apostolic Authority the right to wear the

habit and the square cowl, to grow your beards, and to retire to hermitages and there live . . .

It was well that the Capuchins had obtained permission not to shave, for various Councils, such as that of Sens in 1528, issued decrees against the growing of the beard. At this time there was no argument over the beard with the other branches of the Franciscan Order. It was only later that a controversy arose with the Observants as to whether St. Francis wore a beard.

The first Capuchin Constitutions of Albacina, 1529, make no mention of the beard. The reason for this is that the Bull of Clement VII had granted permission for it and no new legislation was needed. In 1535 and 1536, the Constitutions were revised and the motives for wearing the beard were given. The Constitutions declare: "The friars shall wear the beard after the example of Christ Most Holy, and all our first saints, since it is something manly, natural, severe, despised and austere." At the time these Constitutions were written, secular people also wore the beard. The reason the Capuchins called the beard "despised" is that whereas lay people wore their beards short and trimmed, the friars had long "uncultivated" beards.

A number of modifications and additions appeared in the Constitutions throughout the centuries, but the article on the wearing of the beard was retained. The Constitutions were

edited in 1575, 1608, 1643, and again in 1908 when Pope Pius X approved and confirmed them in the Apostolic Letter, *Vicarium Pastoris Aeterni*. Then because of the promulgation of the new Code of Canon Law the Constitutions were revised and approved again in 1920. These final Constitutions have this regulation in regard to the beard:

The tonsure shall be cut at least once a month, and following the example of Christ, of our Seraphic Father St. Francis, of other saints, and of our primitive Fathers, the friars shall wear the beard, since it is manly, natural and austere; but they shall not take care of it after the manner of seculars.

THE LAITY AND THE BEARD

The present almost universal custom of shaving among the laity came into being during the reigns of Louis XIII and XIV (1610-1715) of France. Both of these kings had ascended the throne without a beard, and the royal court and inhabitants of the French cities, following the kings' example, soon began to shave. Since France soon took the lead in all matters of fashion on the continent of Europe, shaving became a general practice. However, shaving the whole beard did not become common until the 18th century. Although there were several notable attempts to re-introduce the practice of wearing the beard, the practice of shav-

ing continued until it became a universal custom in the first part of the 20th century.

Within the ranks of the clergy today, only the Camaldolese and Capuchins regularly wear the beard. Other Orders permit the beard in mission countries, and the Franciscans in the Holy Land regularly wear it.

BENEFITS OF THE BEARD

In 1949, the General of the Capuchins, in a letter directed to the whole Order, wrote of the place of the beard in the modern world. Although the wearing of the beard is today held in contempt by the world, there are many benefits derived from continuing the custom by the members of the Order. The main benefits listed are growth in the virtue of humility, the practice of self-denial and the example by which the friars can induce men to despise the things of the earth.

Perhaps this is one reason why the Capuchin branch of the Franciscan Order merited the special approval of His Holiness Pius X. In the Apostolic Letter confirming and approving the Constitutions the Pope declared: "It is, indeed, greatly to be desired that they should always maintain unimpaired what We have described as their peculiar characteristic, namely, a close imitation of their Father, St. Francis."

But Is It Socialism?

HERMAN T. STICHMAN

New York State Commissioner of Housing

*Reprinted from JUSTICE**

THE conditions which exist in slums do not affect alone the individuals who live there. Substandard areas take their toll from the citizenship of the entire municipality.

If private enterprise cannot do the slum clearance and neighborhood redevelopment job, government would not seem to be competing with it by entering this essential field on a proper basis.

New York State, through its government, has for years been working with its citizens to improve family living and, in order to achieve that goal, has been aiding our municipalities and private builders in clearing substandard sections and providing good homes in good neighborhoods.

But our State government only goes so far in its direct handling of the problem. The determination here has been that if citizens individually cannot solve the problem of the home and its surrounding neighborhood, they should do so acting together as a group, as a government.

Some believe that any direct public aid in the building of housing, even for families in the lowest income earning groups, is Socialism or worse. Others, also among those in opposition and who are themselves engaged in housing or real estate, have said that the same funds should be paid over to them so that they may subsidize housing instead of having public agencies do the job. That, they say, would not be Socialism. They do not dispute the need for government intervention, only the method of applying it.

The electorate decided, however, that when a job vital to the welfare of the public is truly immense—that of redeveloping slum areas, sheltering our lowest income groups over a long term, improving their family living and health conditions generally and reducing juvenile delinquency—the people organized as a government can best accomplish it, as has historically been done, for instance, with public roads, schools and parks.

No informed person regards those functions as Socialistic or suggests

* 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y., Dec. 1, 1953.

that government should subsidize private enterprise in the performance of those functions.

And it has been pointed out that merely by changing the manner of disbursement, that is, paying the money to private builders to do the job to their profit, does not change the character of the basic fact that necessity exists for some government intervention in the field.

The issue remains as to whether the need is so strong, the task, basic as it is to municipal redevelopment, so complex and the inability of private enterprise over the years to accomplish the slum clearance phase so clear, that government aid is required.

If it is, then mere use of the alternative which the majority regard as the more efficient in this instance does not in and of itself change performance of a service essential to the public into something Socialistic. That remains so although the granting of free scope to private initiative to the fullest extent possible is rightly regarded as essential to democracy.

This regard for the essential needs of the underprivileged is of aid not only in this country but in our efforts to combat the "isms" abroad. Thus the representative in Asia of the American Federation of Labor, Richard Deverall, has written to us:

"During the past three weeks I have been touring 15 cities of southern Japan, visiting no less than 200 local union offices. With us we carried hundreds of copies of the March issue of *Rodo Pacific* containing the article based on your material.

"We found a terrific reaction as the local labor leaders wistfully looked at the Al Smith housing project and said: 'My God! Is this capitalist America?' We made many converts with your material! In Japan, public housing projects are generally only for richer persons, not for workers."



Ceremonies

Protestant objection to Catholic ceremonial is an artificial one. Non-Catholics, being human, are just as much impressed by outward actions as are Catholics. They will not openly admit it but accept it in principle. In the early Church there was a heresy known as Manicheism. If our non-Catholic friends, who are very much attached to St. Augustine in his theology of the Redemption, would be equally interested in his theology of the Incarnation, they would discover that their horror of ceremonialism is Manichean in origin. We are born ceremonialists as anyone can prove who has observed the mimicry of children.—THE CATHOLIC STANDARD AND TIMES, *Philadelphia, Pa., Feb. 5, 1954.*

Documentation

Message to the Sick

POPE PIUS XII

Radio message of His Holiness, February 14, 1954

WHEN last September, in response to the inspirations of grace, We proclaimed the celebration of the Marian Year, and shortly after, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, We Ourselves wished to inaugurate it in a solemn way from the brilliant Liberian Basilica, by going there to lay Our petitions at the feet of her who is the "Salvation of the Roman people" and of all peoples, even then We were thinking of you, beloved sons and daughters who are ill, you who can lay special claim to be among those closest to Our heart and soul.

The Mother of God, indeed, bends over you with loving tenderness, eager to dry the tears of the afflicted who run to her maternal breast as to a secure haven in the tempests. So also the Vicar of Christ relies upon you, the precious jewels of the Church of God and her powerful source of spiritual energy, for the realization in this holy year of the many and sorely needed blessings envisaged in Our encyclical *Fulgens Corona* for the well-being of humanity and of the Church herself.

This lively hope moves Us to address you today, with the intention of gathering all of you under the loving protection of our common Mother, Mary Immaculate, of surrounding you with Our charity and that of all the faithful who are praying for you, and of reminding you of the mission to which Divine Providence has destined you in your sickness.

Thanks to modern technology We are able to speak directly to many who are ill and We hope that We shall be able to reach in other ways those who cannot hear Our voice. Certainly We would wish to have the omnipresence of God: We would wish to draw near to each one of you, beloved sons and daughters, languishing in hospitals large and small, in sanatoriums, clinics, rest-homes, prisons, barracks, under the desolate roofs of the poorest, or in rooms set apart in your homes. Little children with pale faces like flowers which grew without the warmth of the sun; young people whose rare smile expresses strength of soul rather than the fresh bloom of youth; middle-aged people, cruelly taken away from their usual active lives; the aged, to whose natural weariness sickness has added discomfort and suffering.

We have always begged Jesus to make Our heart in some way like His: a good heart, a meek heart, a heart open to all sufferings, to all pains. But how greatly would We wish to have some reflection of the omnipotence that is His! How We would desire to pass in the midst of you, drying tears, bringing comfort, healing wounds, giving back again strength and health!

We must content Ourselves with being in the midst of you in spirit. We linger beside infants as a mother would, beside parents trembling at the thought of having, perhaps, to leave their children orphans. And to each one We give Our blessing, praying the all-powerful God, our loving Father, to grant, by means of it, whatever He judges suitable to the special plan of providence He has chosen for each one of you. And may the Lord grant that when this brief visit with you in spirit is over, each one of you may feel the good effects, spiritual and material, of Our affectionate blessing, as well as the comfort of the words We address to you with all Our heart.

I.

Behold, We seem to see there in that hospital ward a young man who is suffering and in his suffering is cursing. Once he was strong and handsome; he was the pride and joy of his parents, whose hearts are now breaking because they fear losing him, wasted away by a relentless disease. And the youth feels as if life were slipping away from him: farewell to health, farewell to strength, to the surgings of hope, farewell to the plans cherished with boyish enthusiasm; farewell to love. And the young man rebels: "Why, why? Haven't I, too, a right to life? And can a good God let me suffer so, let me die? What evil have I done?"

How many of you, sons and daughters, how many of you have contorted your features and raged with anger in your hearts and curses on your lips? To you especially would We wish to approach, to place Our hand gently on your brow burning with fever. We would wish, in all tenderness, to whisper to each of you: soul in anguish, why do you rebel? Let fall on this dark mystery of suffering the rays of light which come from the Cross of Jesus! What evil had He done? Look, over your bed, perhaps in the hospital ward, there is a picture of the Madonna. What evil had she done? Soul in desolation, because overwhelmed with suffering, listen to this: Jesus and His Mother have suffered, certainly not through their own fault, but willingly and in complete conformity with the divine plan. Have you ever asked yourself why?

It may be that you have done evil. Think back. Perhaps you have offended God many times, in many ways. You know that a serious sin merits for the soul eternal damnation; and you instead are still alive under the merciful gaze of God, in the loving arms of Mary. If, then, the Lord is now punishing some sin of yours, you should not on that account curse and debase yourself; you are not a slave, as it were, punished by a cruel master, but a child of God punished by a Father Who wishes not to take revenge, but to correct you. He wants you to say to Him: "I have sinned," in order to pardon you and restore to you the life of the soul.

Even if you had done no wrong, if you were innocent, still you should not rebel. As a matter of fact, the idea of punishment does not always explain suffering and human woes. Do you remember what is written in the Gospel? One day Jesus came upon a man born blind, and after His disciples had asked Him whether that man or his parents had sinned, He replied: "Neither has this man sinned, nor his parents, but the works of God

were to be made manifest in him" (*John*, 9, 2-3). Even the misfortunes of the innocent, therefore, are a mysterious manifestation of the divine glory. Lest you be wearied by long reflections, look at the Holy and Immaculate Mother: she holds in her lap the lifeless body of her Divine Son. Could you possibly imagine that the Sorrowful Mother would curse God? That she would ask the reasons for such suffering? We would not have been redeemed if that Mother had not seen her Son die in torment, and there would not have been for us any possibility of salvation.

For all of you, dear children, who do not yet know how to pronounce the "So be it" of resignation and patience, We invoke God's blessing, asking that He send a ray of His light into your souls, and that you may cease to contradict with your will His plan, His will, His work, that you may become convinced that His Divine Fatherhood is still loving and benevolent, even when He judges it necessary to make use of the bitter chalice of suffering.

II.

Yet, it is not always thus, dear children. Not always do souls rebel and curse under the weight of pain. There are, thanks to God, souls resigned to the divine will, serene, joyous souls; souls even that have positively sought out suffering. The story of one in particular We heard during the glorious Holy Year when Our children came to Us in extraordinary numbers from all parts of the world.

There was a young woman, twenty years old, of humble origin, to whom Our Lord had given great charm as well as innocence. Everyone felt her attractiveness, for about her radiated the fragrance of an unsullied life. But one day she grew fearful lest she become an occasion of sin, and becoming interiorly convinced of this, she went to receive Our Lord and in a burst of generosity asked Him to take away all her beauty and even her health. God granted her prayer and accepted her offer for the salvation of souls. We know that she is still living, though burning and being consumed like a living flame before God's throne of justice and love. She does not curse, does not murmur. She does not ask God, "Why?" There is always a smile on her lips and within her soul she treasures abiding peace and joy. One should ask her why she accepts suffering, why she is happy in it, why she looked for sufferings. And the same question should be asked of thousands of other souls who offer themselves to God in silent holocaust.

III.

Beloved sons and daughters! If to your eyes, wearied with sickness, the whole universe, gloomy and oppressive, is confined within the narrow space of a little room, let in the light of faith, and at once it regains its limitless dimensions. Faith will certainly not make you love suffering for its own sake, but it will give you an insight into the many noble reasons for which sickness can be serenely accepted and even desired.

Here is a man who has many sins to expiate, or at least he has stains on his soul: suffering will purify him. Here is a young woman who was once good, but did not possess a strong character, so necessary for one who was

to be a wife and mother: suffering has been for her like a fire which has tempered her and given her great strength. You, perhaps, have desired martyrdom: you have dreamed that the chance might be offered to you also to suffer for Jesus. Thank God for it: your bodily affliction is like shedding blood, a real form of martyrdom. And you, do you want to be like Jesus? Do you want to transform yourself into Him? Do you want to be a channel of life for Him? In sickness you can find the Cross and be nailed to it and thus die to yourself so that He may live and make use of you. How many of you, beloved children, would like to help Jesus save souls? Then offer Him your sufferings according to all the intentions for which He continually offers Himself on the altars of our churches. Your sacrifice, united to the sacrifice of Jesus, will bring many sinners back to the Father; many without faith will find the true Faith; many weak Christians will receive the strength to live fully the teaching and the law of Christ. And on the day on which the mystery of Providence in the economy of salvation will be revealed in Heaven, you will finally see to what extent the world of the healthy is your debtor.

And now, beloved sons and daughters, We leave you. We pray to Jesus, friend of the suffering, to remain with you, to remain in you. We pray to the Immaculate Virgin, your most affectionate Mother, to comfort you with her smile and to protect you beneath her mantle.



Advantage of Large Family

There is no substitute for the family and family life in the education of children. It is often forgotten that besides parents children themselves are children's educators. The child wants to work and play with other children. It is much more fun than playing, even more elaborately and expensively, with grown-ups, and the child that does not get at home the companionship of brothers and sisters misses a lot which is irreplaceable in its development. The straight talk that children indulge in about each other's faults and failings hurts indeed at times, but it never hurts so much as would the same remarks from outsiders. In the rough and tumble of home life children learn that the world is not centered on themselves. There are other children with at least equal rights, with perhaps some admitted claim, on the score of age and advancement in knowledge, to equal, and even prior, treatment and preference.

Children learn from each other to defer to one another. In the same family, under the watchful eye of good parents, they give way to one another (with an occasional squall, because the lesson is not always pleasant), they cooperate, they swallow and stomach little snubs and setbacks, and, in short, they fit themselves to be good school children and good citizens later on.—THE TRIBUNE, Melbourne, Australia, Jan. 28, 1954.

On Public Housing

POPE PIUS XII

An address by His Holiness to members of the Autonomous Institute for Popular Housing of the Province of Rome, November 21, 1953.

CORDIALLY We greet you, beloved children, who are gathered from all parts of Italy to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Autonomous Institute for Popular Housing of the Province of Rome, and who await from Us Our blessing on your works and a word of encouragement.

Since all of you are engaged in the management of similar institutes, it can very well be said that your meeting represents the administration of a considerable part of a heritage that has been, or must still be, invested in land, houses and other related real estate, for the benefit of the less wealthy classes of the population.

This fact itself would be enough to arouse the benevolent interest of the Head of the Church and, We would like to add—because of the particular occasion of your congress—of the Bishop of Rome. Furthermore, the industrial progress and the consequent development of large cities during the last hundred years has given to the question of housing such a special aspect that the Pope, the Bishops and Catholic associations have not ceased to give this important and, alas, distressful problem their particular attention.

The problem has been painful from the very beginning and has remained so even to this day. The consequences of the war have rendered it still more difficult and made the need of help still more urgent. Even today We must make Our own the words of Our predecessor Pius XI of glorious memory in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*: "It is horrifying to consider the impediments that the altogether unbecoming state of housing offers to the union and intimacy of family life" (*Acta Ap. Sedis* vol. XXIII p. 221).

This is the position from which the Church sets out, in virtue of Her pastoral office, to commend and invoke your work. She cannot cease to warn and remind that, according to the will of the Creator and the natural order established by Him, the family must be a spiritual and moral, juridical and economic unity; and that strict and imprescriptible laws regulate the birth and the development of a new life.

What a burden arises, therefore, for Christian consciences when future spouses, new domestic hearths, growing families cannot find any shelter, or only an inadequate and often too costly one. The Lord alone knows how often, under such conditions, human weakness has hindered souls from leading a Christian life and injured them also in their faith! You will readily understand why We weigh and evaluate your work above all in its apostolic and pastoral aspect; and We hope that precisely such considerations will serve to give you much greater encouragement and comfort.

This particular apostolic concern for those who, having a family, seek adequate and wholesome housing coincides with the true interest and the objective scope of the national economy.

Morally healthy people are those who in all their material needs put necessary things before the merely useful or pleasurable. They do not let themselves be dragged into a consumption without restraint, the cancer of present-day social economy. They are, on the other hand, always ready to contribute as much as they can through their own energies to the construction and maintenance of their own homes. They wish to belong to the productive forces of the people and not stand in the ranks of those who expect or demand everything from the state. Their attitude of mind, their entire conception of life is in harmony with the solid economic principles of your Institutes, which are not organizations of public assistance but which, by supplying and renewing the means available to individuals, seek to promote the genuine productivity of the national economy.

HOUSING AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

With lively satisfaction have We perceived these principles in your various reports. Public authorities ought, in regard to housing, as in other matters, seek to favor, and in no case oppose, private enterprise. In the case of popular housing, especially, they should favor the enterprise of cooperatives. It is very sad to note what harm false principles cause in this respect and how the difficulties of the postwar period have hindered a more rapid advance on the right road. Certainly, there must always be a strong public power that will methodically and energetically take action.

The competent authorities without doubt ought not to, nor can they, directly or indirectly, take away from ownership every increase of value resulting only from the evolution of local circumstances. But the social function of property ownership demands that such earnings should not hinder others from satisfying properly and at an equitable price a need so essential as that of a home. Therefore oppose, with every means that the common good justifies, usury in property and all economically unproductive financial speculation involving a good so fundamental as the soil. The existence of old and new barrack-like dwellings known as "bee-hives" is, for the most part, due to the negligence of those who bear responsibility for the common good and for the preventive measures that this good requires.

May the development of modern techniques and of appropriate legal forms, and above all a peaceful revival of national economy, marked especially by an increase of wealth among all the classes of the people, permit your Institutes to extend the notable results they have already achieved. We are thinking of benefits such as the ownership of a house or at least of an apartment. We are thinking of greater utilization of the type of extensive housing construction in place of the mixed type, though the latter is almost the only possible type in given circumstances of construction which is both intensive and extensive.

Without doubt, the outward appearance of Rome in some areas is still very sad; and the same seems to be true also of other large cities. Not to

ay

speak of the houses falling into ruin, or that are entirely unsafe, there are still—or, to put it better—there continue to crop up again and again the “barracks,” the “grottoes,” the “little caves,” and the “roosts” in cellars and other uninhabitable places. It is necessary to remember that the influx is always great of those attracted by the deceptive fascination of the great city and the expectation of an easier and less disturbed life there.

With good reason, therefore, you seek the solution of the problem of housing against a greater background—on a regional basis, and, finally, in line with a unified national plan for the general good of the nation and the more widespread well-being of the Italian people. In this regard, you find yourselves in harmony with the fundamental principles of the social doctrine of the Church.

The country, the territory that is inhabited by a people united in a state and linked together by the common good, is not merely, even from an economic viewpoint, as economic liberalism would have it, the expanse of lands where the mechanism of momentarily lower costs and more favorable conditions of trade determine the destiny and the appointed lot of men. Rather, the national soil is the place in which a people, with all its vital activities, and in a succession of generations, fixes its roots, as the plant that grows down into the earth. The national soil, therefore, must be cultivated and cared for if it is desired that it contribute to a true productivity of the nation, even economic. This is the lofty purpose toward whose attainment your Institutes work.

We conclude these brief considerations by willingly recognizing once again the importance of your work in the serious field of housing in Italy. Meanwhile, with a full heart, We call down upon you, upon your labors and upon your families, the choicest blessing of Heaven.



Sacramentals

In using sacramentals, the Church takes into account that human beings are made up of soul and body, that they are affected by sensible impressions. Thus by giving us the Crucifix to place vividly before us the love and sufferings of the world's Saviour, by giving us blessed ashes to remind us forcefully of our own frailty and mortality, by giving us candles, the light of which symbolizes Christ as the Light of the World, the Church intelligently and effectually uses sensible things in order to promote spiritual effects. Nor can it be said that such means as these are useful for the ignorant but not for the learned. All men are made up of soul and body; all are susceptible, therefore, to inspiration, benefit or harm from sense impressions.—THE CATHOLIC SENTINEL, *Portland, Oregon, Feb. 4, 1954.*

Human Values in the Rural Community

Declaration of Principles issued by the Union Internationale d'Etudes Sociales, Malines, September, 1949.

*Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX**

I. Rural Values

COUNTRY life makes a deep impression on a man's character and develops in him precious moral and social values. Some of these result from the life and work of the farm; others are characteristic of all who dwell in the country, no matter what their trade or profession. Taken as a whole they impress on the entire rural community a special and unmistakable character.

In addition to these characteristics of universal application country life gives rise to special questions in certain countries. So on the one hand we have problems of general interest, and on the other, questions which interest only certain districts or certain countries. This statement will deal chiefly with the former but touch also on the latter.

A. THE CHARACTER

1) *of every countryman.*—The countryman spends his life in permanent contact with nature. He knows all the splendor, and suffers all the bitterness, of the seasons. With the open sky over his head and the open country before his eyes, he is toughened by the fight against rough weather and finds in the open air the stimulant and the reward of his efforts. His physical surroundings are healthy.

The rural dwelling, even if small, looks out on the open spaces; the garden and surrounding outhouses connect it with the open country where the countryman can move around at his ease.

In fine the countryman drinks at the very springs of life. In contrast to the city-dweller, his life passes in familiar contact with living things, plants or animals. His mind is taken up with watching them and looking after them. Another difference from the towns, the rhythm of life is easy-going, spent mostly in the open and the quiet of the countryside.

2) *of the farmer.*—If he is a tiller of the soil or a breeder of animals, the countryman knows by experience the needs of the soil, the risks and the damage caused by the weather, the proper rules of breeding. His art consists in using all these things to produce living things and so provide a living for himself. Surrounded by uncertainty, ceaselessly restrained by the visible results of his actions, the farmer learns to weigh his risks. He is aware of his strength but also knows well his limits.

The farmer learns delicacy in the handling of living things. He is aware of his duty to the land, the duty to work patiently to make it fertile. He learns

* Main St., Naas, Ireland, April, 1961

calculating foresight and reasoned prudence. He is full of the sense of the rebirth of nature and the eternal youth of creation. He has a lively feeling of personal responsibility, the habit of quiet reflection. He is clever in dealing with difficulties; he is hard-working all the year round. Finally he is proud of his harvest. Such characteristics, the results of the farmer's life, are the real mark of the true farmer.

Whether he is the owner of the land or whether he merely owns the cattle, the crops and the machinery, the farmer is his own master. More than is the case with other independent professions or trades, a long tradition handed down from age to age, the very nature of the work itself and often, in addition, a sentimental love of the land—all these factors endow life on the land with a fullness and stability without parallel. In satisfying his own needs, in carrying out humbly his task, the farmer learns a moral ideal in his everyday work. Self-knowledge, care of his personal dignity, an honest independence, a sense of tradition, respect for realities are all part of the make-up of the man who lives on and by the land.

Yet there are disadvantages also in the farmer's life from the social and moral point of view. His independence in his work, the narrowness, in some ways, of his life convince him that he can rely only on himself. He is in danger of developing an individualism which takes little notice of social truths and may even deceive him as to his own true interests.

On the other hand a meagre return for so much hard work often tends to make him hard in money matters, too careful of his expenditure at the expense of technical advances and of domestic comforts. Unless he takes care, then, the farmer is in danger of narrow-

mindedness and a blind sticking to tradition.

B. THE FAMILY

No matter what the trade or profession of the father, the rural family enjoys the tremendous advantage of pure air and healthy surroundings. The education of the children is easily based on reality by contact with nature herself.

More especially on the farm, domestic union is allied to union in work. The running of a farm requires in many cases the united efforts of man and wife, sons and daughters. This work in common strengthens the family loyalties and gives the father a much better chance to train his children and to teach them in a practical way the principles and habits handed down from his forefathers. In this way rural life promotes, better than the city, the unity, the stability and the fertility of the family.

C. THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

The local community also reveals a spirit which is characteristic of it. It forms a center where everyone knows everybody else, where relations are fixed and constant between the different classes and trades. This ease of meeting in a limited concrete framework tends to improve the individual character; every member of the community counts for something in this society, which exists for its members. It also favors social intercourse and makes the whole complete life of the district a lesson in collective life. For everyone is a witness of the tasks and difficulties of all; the common need shows up in everyday realities. This openness of life strengthens a general influence which tends to a respect for accepted values. All are surrounded by this influence, whether they are attached to the land or not.

But on the other hand the relative isolation of country life which still exists in many districts can lead the countryman to exaggerate the importance of local interests, to ignore those of the community as a whole and to develop an exaggerated local patriotism. In addition, the frequency of their contacts with their neighbors exposes country-dwellers to the danger of quarrels, which develop sometimes into an obstinate feud between whole families.

D. RURAL CIVILIZATION

These qualities combine together to form a kind of man who can be found in every continent, under the most diverse climates, among the most different races. It is the result of a mode of life where man faces the hard but generous earth either as a worker on the land or in some other way. It is a kind of life which, with traditional peasant wisdom, brings forth what may be called a sort of rural civilization.

On a higher plane, unless agricultural or industrial occupations take so much time and labor as to impose a real serfdom, rural life lends itself to a development of the religious sense and to a preservation of Christian traditions, based on real family life and a real living parish.

To sum up, whether it is composed solely of farmers and farm-laborers or contains also tradesmen and wage earners, employes of the public services, members of the liberal professions, the rural population is an important factor of physical and moral stability.

II. Principles of a Rural Revival

A. IN GENERAL

At a time when many qualities of the human mind are in danger of disap-

pearing as a result of mass-production, the growth of proletarianism and of purely mechanical work, and also as a result of the acceptance by the masses of false values, the need to preserve and improve rural life stands out in striking relief. More than at any other time society is in need of the revivifying support of the countryside. But this help will only be possible if the human values attached to rural life are maintained in their integrity.

But in many regions rural life suffers from serious faults and does not quite come up to the picture we have painted of it. In the first place, the rural population is not sufficiently conscious of the qualities which are natural to it, nor of the advantages of the surroundings it has always known. On the other hand, rural values are not equally developed everywhere; in some places they are in danger of disappearing. In some regions routine methods of agriculture, lack of education, even the complete ignorance of the agricultural class deprive farmers of material profit and of all intellectual interests. The peasant's home is often nothing but a hovel. Excessive work crushes the man and enslaves the woman. Many rural workers have become wage-slaves.

As a result of these defects, rural life has fallen into a discredit which hides its real advantages. Many suffer from a sense of humiliation and deception and take a dislike to a labor which, though hard and long, still leaves them in want. They lose their attachment to the countryside. This desire to get away is reinforced by the attraction of the towns and of employment in industry, which often gives a better chance of profit and at the same time offers many practical comforts.

These influences combine to produce a depopulation of the countryside. In

some places not only the excess population, but large numbers of those required on the land and especially the young are flowing into the towns at an alarming rate. Thus transplanted and cut off from their traditions, many country people quickly lose their advantages. Restricted lodgings affect the size of the family. Social life is deprived of the stimulant of its natural variety and dries up. In the town, work is more often a task of a purely mechanical nature than one of individual creation. Even amusements are of a less personal kind. The mind is fed on fleeting impressions rather than living realities, and loses its capacity of reflection. A feverish rush takes the place of a regular order of tasks. Excitement of all kinds replaces silence and leisure and upsets the serenity of the mind.

Without neglecting what constitutes, so to speak, its soul, the rural world must correct those defects in the material, cultural and social order so as to remove this inferiority in comparison with the towns, factories and cultured circles. It must bring a new life to the countryside by modernization. To change the form does not always alter the essentials. These essential truths are not necessarily tied to certain old-fashioned customs which are, so to speak, the ornaments of life and add a folklore interest. Technical progress is possible; the homes and customs of the people can change without injuring these profound truths.

The revival of country life must be above all the work of the country people themselves. But it can only be worked out in a spirit of general respect and understanding shown in national and international policy. The first aim is to enable the countryside to support a large and prosperous population. The farmers must be assured

of a reasonable profit and reasonable conditions of life. Rural industries must be established on the spot to give employment to the excess population. Facilities must be created to allow town workers to live in the country.

B. ECONOMICS AND PRODUCTION

1) *Agriculture.*—It is obvious that agriculture is the most important thing in country life. Its produce ensures the security and independence of the nation and lessens the effect of economic crises and of war. It is therefore important that agriculture should retain its rightful place in economic and social life. It must not be sacrificed to urban industry, even in countries where the latter is more important. Nevertheless at a time when economic activities are conducted on a world-wide scale, agriculture can only become living and prosperous if it uses all technical advances, adapts itself to the needs of both local and distant markets and accepts necessary changes.

In common with the general progress, the farmer must increase his efforts, vary his products so as to increase their value and give employment to greater numbers in proportion to the rising standard of life in the surrounding population. Steward of the land, the farmer must give an account of its wealth and his use of it to the society which expects from him its sustenance. He owes it to the future generations to increase the fertility of the land and to pass it on to them with an increased value.

For this development agriculture will need credit. Loans should be available to small farmers without excessive delays or useless formalities. In granting them account should be taken of the personal character of the borrower.

Taxation on agriculture should take

account of the great diversity of soil, the great differences in revenue from one year to another and of the fact that the whole family take part in the labor. If the rates and taxes are too high, the farmer loses all incentive to work.

2) *Rural Industry*.—The excess population, unable to find an occupation on the land, must find work on the spot, especially in congested districts. Industry then should be encouraged to spread itself through the countryside. The distribution of motive power should be so planned as to encourage the setting up in the villages or country of numerous small factories or workshops of the family or artisan type. Industries derived from agriculture, forestry and fishing should be encouraged to establish themselves in the country.

3) *Connected Occupations*.—One occupation, in agriculture, industry or commerce, should normally suffice to support a man and his family. But in many places for a long time now the force of circumstances has obliged some people to combine different trades and to practise them either regularly or seasonably. A large part of the rural population often depends on such outside work for its sustenance and a change would oblige many to leave the countryside. Nevertheless this mixing of trades must not be allowed to overburden the worker, nor deprive him of reasonable leisure, nor must it deprive his family of his presence.

On the other hand the wage-earner will find a useful stimulant for his own personality in an independent activity such as tillage or stock-breeding on a small scale. By sharing in the farmer's work he also shares in his advantages.

C. THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

1) *Property and its use*—*The Small Farm*. Ownership of the land is a

necessary condition of independence and a guarantee of security. It is a great help to the development of character. "Of all the goods that can form the object of ownership none conforms better with nature than the land, the one good on which the family lives and from which it draws in whole or in part its subsistence" (*Rerum Novarum*). It is therefore of the greatest importance that the largest possible number of families of every profession and class should enjoy ownership of some small part of the land and especially their own houses. Credit should be granted and reduction of taxes made to the families of farm-laborers and small tradesmen to enable them to purchase.

It is, however, an abuse of ownership which leads some people to limit the number of their children in order to acquire land or to preserve it intact.

On the other hand farm-workers must maintain their liberty of employment and so it will be better for them, rather than to purchase, to rent their homes from some kind of "workers' building society."

The Big Estates. The acquisition of large stretches of land in order to exploit them in a capitalist manner tends to destroy the personal and family characteristics of agriculture. It destroys the attachment to the land and reduces to the position of employees a large number of rural workers. It sometimes creates the danger of monopoly with its effect on prices, and tends to aggravate the opposition which exists in some countries between town and country.

These large estates, insufficiently cultivated, prevent, on the one hand, the spread of small farms, and, on the other, diminish intensity of production, which is a necessary condition for subsistence of large numbers. For these reasons we must aim at their reduction by divid-

ing the land among landless families who are capable of farming it successfully. If gentle pressure does not lead in a reasonable time to voluntary sale, it may be necessary to proceed by expropriation or forced sale with just compensation. At the risk of total failure this agrarian reform must aim, not only at a better distribution of the land, but also at an improvement in production and in the technical education of the new owners. Distribution by lot will avoid all privileged abuses.

Large estates and large-scale exploitation can still be justified both economically and socially. It is only in this way that experiments on a large scale in tillage and breeding can be kept up. The maximum acreage allowed to any one owner can only be decided by taking into account the nature of the soil and the possibilities of its use.

Land Division. In some places excessive division of the land, in ownership or in actual use, tends to drive large numbers below the maximum standard of living. If intensification of production is impossible even by cooperative methods, the remedy must be sought in industrial employment either whole or part-time. Where the different parts of the farms are too widely separated from each other by the land of another, some sort of rearrangement should be possible by voluntary exchange or if necessary by legal methods.

The renting of land, whether at a fixed fee or on a profit-sharing basis such as exists in some countries, must be regulated so as to stimulate effort and to reward the labors of the tenant. Of course, account must be taken of the risks inherent in the farmer's profession. The rent or other payments due to the owner must allow the tenant sufficient profit to maintain his family decently and put something by for a rainy day.

One of the conditions of the contract should fix sufficient time to ensure security and encourage progress. If the farm is put up for sale, the tenant should have the first offer.

Farm Laborers. In vast regions of the world there has developed a large agrarian proletariat composed of families who own no land nor even implements and who are reduced by the smallness of the wage to a miserable life. Driven below a proper living standard these unfortunates are exposed to the inclemency of the weather, to depression of food prices and are sometimes even threatened with famine.

Where exploitation on a large scale requires the employment of large numbers permanently or for the season, these workers are entitled to a just family wage, decent living conditions and proper conditions of work. These should be arranged in a collective contract. Apart from intrinsic reasons, the extension of national health insurance schemes to rural workers is a useful factor of stability. The trade union will be for them as for the industrial worker a powerful means of protection and help.

2) *The Family.*—In a family working on the land there is a danger of expecting too much from the members of it. Though the parental authority must be respected, yet the common enterprise must ensure the future of every member of the family. Every child has a strict right to a suitable education. The parents have no right to set them to work too soon, nor to put off their marriage too long. The cooperation of the children in the family task is usually rewarded at the time of their setting up a separate home and family.

On the other hand, agricultural work often puts too heavy a burden on the woman. Technical progress can make

things easier for her and, with the help of various kinds of women's associations, give her time to devote herself to the tasks of the home and the education of her children.

Lest inheritance should split up the land too much, it is desirable that a proper legal system should ensure that it remains in the one family from generation to generation.

3) *Farmers' Trade Guilds.*—The spirit of union and collective discipline constitutes for the farming community, as for every other social class, a means of defence and an aid to progress. They counterbalance the individualism and selfishness into which the farmer can so easily fall. Guilds, under different forms, have alone allowed the small farmer in many countries to surmount grave crises, to tackle successfully necessary technical changes; to keep in his own hands the ownership of the soil or at least of his tools. They form the only means of facing up to new situations and new problems. Where they are lacking the farmer class very often merely drifts.

In order to constitute a factor of personal progress and social education, these associations should be instituted under the protection and encouragement of the public authorities, but not under their immediate direction. Co-operation properly understood stimulates cultural and moral progress as much as material well-being. This is a fact whether it is applied to the commercial side of farming, such as the purchase and sale of produce, or is extended to cover the whole work of the farm, so as to constitute a real community of work. In the same way an association established on a wide basis helps to insure against personal and professional risks. It also lends itself to the granting of credit at a cheap rate.

It is desirable that a professional framework recognized by law should crown all these agricultural institutions by an organization of an autonomous character, animated by large ideas, open to initiative and provided with centers for study and documentation. Agriculture as such will thus have a representative before the public authorities. It will take its rightful place in the councils which inspire the social and economic policy of each country. In developing on these different planes its means of action, in uniting all independent producers and wage-earners in accordance with the peculiar structure of each nation, the guild will convince the agricultural class of its real value and its possibilities. It will help it to improve its position and put at its disposition many practical services. In countries of an industrial and urban type, it will compensate to some extent the farmers for the disadvantage of being in a minority.

4) *The Local Community.*—There are certain conditions necessary to preserve the vitality of the local community. These are the maintenance of local autonomy and the responsibilities attached to it, and secondly, respect for, and if necessary the revival of, the customs and traditions of the countryside which make it one large family. Those who leave it for their daily work or in seasonal migration can thus refresh themselves on their return in healthy surroundings which are dear to them, among neighbors who understand the problems of each one and where mutual help is widely practised. In this way the local community will continue to form the foundation-stone of the national life, will give the first lessons in political training, will be the elementary school of those seeking public office. In the same way the rural parish,

a union of all the families, should show itself a real spiritual community, a source of cultural and social inspiration.

5) *Rural Residence*.—Within a wide radius of large cities and industrial centers, it is desirable to encourage those who work in the city, whether wage-earners or independently, to live in the country and to go in for tillage or stock-breeding on a small scale. In addition to the healthy atmosphere, in times of depression or unemployment this will be considerable help economically. This kind of semi-rural life, with one foot in the country and the other in the town, which has been widely developed in some countries makes the city worker share to a large extent in the material and moral advantages of country life.

6) *Special Questions—Dependent Countries*. In colonial countries and dependent territories rural life with its best traditions has been completely upset by the irruption of large-scale industry and especially by the more or less forced recruitment of workers. The effects of this dislocation are worse here than elsewhere. It is necessary to safeguard the native peasantry from the excesses of an over-hasty industrialization, against the encroachments of the white colonists, against excessive taxation and the abuse of state requisitions, especially in matters of public works.

In all the colonies under their control the home-countries have a duty, by their general economy and commercial policy, to prevent an agricultural depression, which brings as a result a flight to the towns and pauperism.

7) *Land Clearance and Colonization*. In countries where wide-open spaces still lend themselves to clearance and cultivation, a policy of colonization should be carried out so as to favor the transfer of family and village communities.

D. BY A GENERAL REVIVAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

1) *Material Equipment for the Countryside*.—The maintenance of the rural population depends on the general development of the decencies of life in the country. The work on the land must be made easier by the greater utilization of proper agricultural machinery. Better housing, good roads and a proper water supply are all necessary to provide a healthier and more attractive country life.

From each town should radiate a good transport system at cheap rates so as to permit rural inhabitants who work in the town to get in and out easily every day, and to allow the others easy access to the town without offence to human dignity or morality.

2) *Education and Culture*.—Rural progress presupposes the development of general education and the spread of agricultural and technical schools so as to be within reach of all those who should benefit by them. It also demands a wider knowledge and practice of the rules of hygiene.

It is very important that the elementary school should remain in the countryside. Under teachers who are themselves full of the spirit of the country the children should learn to love it. All the children, whether of the farming class or not, should learn to recognize the value of the country. The secondary school will seek its inspiration in an effort to train and prepare real leaders for the countryside, men of wide reading, intelligent and cultured.

It is on the spirit of the youth that the future of the countryside with all that it represents depends. If the youth tend to abandon it, rural life will stagnate; if on the contrary the young people deliberately decide to keep to the

country they will infuse into it new life and freshness.

Just as the entire social order, so too rural realities could be considered solely from the material point of view of production. Certain reforms miss their objective because they aim at economic production to the detriment of the human being, or else destroy personality by an excessive socialization of his activities. It is therefore more than ever necessary to preserve where it still exists, and to create afresh under a modern form where it has disappeared, a personal and collective training that constitutes a veritable philosophy of the countryside.

3) *The Spiritual Revival.*—In order that the rural element of the population fulfill its proper role in the world of today, its economic and intellectual revival should go hand in hand with a defence of Christian morals and a spiritual revival. It must recognize the virtues of the rural life and preserve them for themselves and for the world. Religion is in harmony with rural life and is not only the spring which raises to God, but reveals to man the profound virtues of the country and fixes them in the natural order. Without religion the service of the land is in danger of crushing man; with it his life is a sane, healthy one, physically, morally and spiritually.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Paul A. Reed

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.